

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO

Skopos theory and the translation of picture books

A case study of *Richard Scarry's ABC Word Book* and
its Finnish translation

Maija Käcklund
Master's Thesis
English Translation
Department of Modern Languages
University of Helsinki
April 2016

Tiedekunta/Osasto – Fakultet/Sektion – Faculty		Laitos – Institution – Department	
Humanistinen tiedekunta		Nykykielten laitos	
Tekijä – Författare – Author Maija Käcklund			
Työn nimi – Arbetets titel – Title Skopos theory and the translation of picture books: A case study of <i>Richard Scarry's ABC Word Book</i> and its Finnish translation.			
Oppiaine – Läroämne – Subject Englannin kääntäminen			
Työn laji – Arbetets art – Level		Aika – Datum – Month and year	Sivumäärä – Sidoantal – Number of pages
Pro gradu -tutkielma		04/2016	Pro gradu 56 s, suomenkielinen lyhennelmä 14 s
Tiivistelmä – Referat – Abstract			
<p>Tutkielmassa tarkastellaan Richard Scarryn <i>Richard Scarry's ABC Word Book</i> (2001[1971]) -lastenkirjan suomenkielistä käännöstä <i>ABC Kirja</i> (2008[1974]) lastenkirjallisuuden kääntämisen ja skopos-teorian valossa. Teos on 61-sivuinen kuvitettu aakkoskirja, jonka jokaisella aukeamalla on yksi aakkonen. Kyseinen aakkonen esiintyy aukeamalla olevissa teksteissä, jotka koostuvat yksittäisistä substantiiveista, lausekkeista tai lyhyistä tekstikappaleista. Tekstit liittyvät ja viittaavat kuvituksessa esiintyviin asioihin, esineisiin, henkilöihin ja tilanteisiin. Aakkoskirjan tarkoituksena on opettaa pienelle lapselle aakkosia ja viihdyttää lapsilukijaa. Tutkielman aiheen valintaperusteena on puute kuvakirjojen kääntämisen tutkimuksesta ja eritoten aakkoskirjojen kääntämisen tutkimuksesta. Tarkoituksena on myös tapaustutkimuksen avulla soveltaa skopos-teoriaa kuvakirjojen kääntämiseen.</p> <p>Lastenkirjallisuuden kääntämisessä korostuvat usein kulttuuriset eroavaisuudet lähtö- ja kohdeyleisön välillä. Näistä käytetään usein termejä kotouttaminen ja vieraannuttaminen. Kotouttaminen tarkoittaa käännöstieteissä lähestymistapaa, jossa kääntäjä tuo tekstin lähemmäs kohdekulttuurin lukijaa häivyttämällä lähtötekstin vieraita elementtejä. Kotouttamisen vastakohdassa, vieraannuttamisessa, kääntäjä säilyttää kohdekulttuurin lukijalle vieraat elementit käännöksessään. Tutkielman tukena käytetään näkemyksiä lasten kuvakirjojen kääntämisestä, sillä kuvituksella on suuri merkitys käännösratkaisujen kannalta. Kuvitus asettaa rajoja kääntäjän ratkaisuille, mutta se voi tarpeen tullen tarjota myös vihjeitä ja inspiraatiota. Tutkielman teoriapohja nojautuu myös Hans J. Vermeerin (Reiss & Vermeer 2013) hahmottelemaan skopos-teoriaan, jossa käännöksen tarkoitus (skopos) määrää sen sisällön.</p> <p>Tutkielman analyysiosiossa tarkastellaan alkutekstiä ja sen käännöstä esitetyn teorian valossa. Huomio kohdistuu englannin ja suomen erilaisiin aakkosjärjestelmiin, mikä on johtanut aakkosten kotouttamiseen käännöksessä. Aakkosten kotouttaminen on johtanut myös niiden järjestyksen muuttamiseen. Nämä asiat vaikuttavat merkittävästi myös kääntäjän käännösratkaisuihin, sillä jokaisten aukeaman tekstien on sisällettävä kyseinen aakkonen. Kääntäjä voi valita suoran suomenkielisen vastineen vain, jos se sisältää annetun aakkosen. Muussa tapauksessa kääntäjä on käyttänyt esimerkiksi poistoja, lisäyksiä tai spesifikaatioita suomennosratkaisuihin. Pidempien virkkeiden ja tekstikappaleiden kohdalla suora käännös on vielä vaikeampi toteuttaa, jolloin kääntäjä on päätenyt luomaan vapaamman suomennoksen. Kuvat rajaavat käännösratkaisuja, mutta monissa kohdissa kääntäjä näyttää myös hakeneen kuvituksesta inspiraatiota suomennokseen.</p> <p>Lisäksi analyysiosiossa keskitytään kertojan ja lukijan väliseen vuorovaikutukseen sekä suomennoksessa esiintyviin kotouttaviin ratkaisuihin hahmojen nimissä ja yksittäisissä tekstikohdissa. Lähtöteksti pyrkii osallistamaan lasta lukuprosessiin esittämällä tälle kysymyksiä. Myös käännös toteuttaa tätä ominaisuutta, vaikkakaan ei aina samoissa kohdissa kuin alkuteksti. Henkilöhahmojen nimet on kotoutettu suomenkielisiksi, sillä suomennoksen ilmestymisen aikaan kotouttaminen oli Suomessa yleisesti käytetty käännösstrategia. Lisäksi ratkaisuun vaikuttaa tekstin luettavuus ja se, että monella teoksessa esiintyvällä hahmolla on jo olemassa vakiintunut suomenkielinen vastine. Käännöksessä on myös havaittavissa yksittäisiä tekstikohtia, joissa esiintyy kotouttavia käännösratkaisuja. Alkuteksti ei kuitenkaan usein sisällä vieraannuttavia elementtejä, joten kotouttamisen valintaa on todennäköisesti ohjannut enemmänkin tekstin skopos.</p> <p>Analyyisin tulokset osoittavat, että kääntäjän käännösratkaisuja ohjaa käännöksen tarkoitus (skopos) — viihdyttää lapsilukijaa ja opettaa tälle aakkosia. Myös tekstin rakenne on osa skoposta; käännöksen jokaisen aukeaman on lähtötekstin tapaan sisällettävä yksi aakkonen, joka esiintyy aukeamalla olevissa teksteissä.</p>			
Avainsanat – Nyckelord – Keywords Lastenkirjallisuuden kääntäminen, kuvakirjat, aakkoskirjat, skopos-teoria			
Säilytyspaikka – Förvaringställe – Where deposited Helsingin yliopiston kirjasto – Helda /E-thesis (opinnäytteet) ethesis.helsinki.fi			
Muita tietoja – Övriga uppgifter – Additional information			

Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
2	Author and material	4
3	Children's literature and translation	8
3.1	The picture book — translating two media	19
4	<i>Skopos</i> theory.....	25
5	Analysis	31
5.1	<i>Skopos</i> of the source and target text	31
5.2	Localization of the letters of alphabet	31
5.3	Letters and illustrations — double trouble	35
5.4	Narrator—Narratee interaction.....	43
5.5	Character names and domestication	45
6	Conclusions.....	50
	List of sources	54
7	Suomenkielinen lyhennelmä.....	57

List of Tables

Table 1: order of the letters in the source and target text	33
Table 2: examples of substitution	35
Table 3: examples of dialogue in the target text.....	36
Table 4: examples of specification in the target text	37
Table 5: examples of literal translation equivalents	40
Table 6: examples where literal translation could have been used in the target text	40
Table 7: examples of reader interaction in the source text	43
Table 8: examples of reader interaction in the target text	44
Table 9: examples of text-in-pictures in the source and target text....	47

1 Introduction

Children's books and picture books are usually the first works that influence the development of our literary tastes. Many of us remember our favorite childhood books, and some of us have preserved these works for future generations. Others keep the books because they are nostalgic and bring back memories from childhood. Whatever the reason may be, children's books evoke strong feelings in us. In addition to the entertaining function, children's literature has an important impact on the child's verbal and imaginative development. Picture books are usually the first literature small children encounter from very early on, and they stimulate the emergent readers' imagination and entice them to verbal communication. In Finland, today's young readers are more likely to encounter a children's book that is a translation. In 2014, there were 478 translated children's books published in Finland, of which 222 were picture books. The same year 375 domestic children's books were published and 126 of them were picture books. The amount of translated books was therefore 56 per cent. In 2010—2012 the difference was even greater; 62—69 percent of all published children's books were translations. (www.lastenkirjainstituutti.fi/lisatietoa-kirjakorista-2014/.)

One would think that such an important area of translation would automatically attract a lot of attention from researches. However, for many years the study of the translation of children's literature was in fact in child's shoes. The first works concerning the topic were published in the 1960's, but their perspective was not linguistic or theoretical (O'Sullivan 2013: 454). In 1980's the matter was about to change; systematic approaches from within and outside children's literature studies began to emerge. This was also contributed by the formulation of an empirical and descriptive orientation in translation studies. The growing interest towards the translation of children's literature led to numerous influential publications throughout the 1980's and 1990's. (O'Sullivan 2013: 455.) However, serious research into this topic has emerged only recently, and much more in-depth investigation needs to be done in order to expand our knowledge further (O'Sullivan 2013: 460).

Similarly, the picture book remained a somewhat uncharted area amongst scholars until the 1980's. Although plenty of publications have emerged since, disagreement

on key issues, such as on the nature of the picture book, still exists. (Lewis 2001: xii.) Against this background, it is unsurprising that not much has been said about the translation of picture books either. However, the translation process of a picture book is a demanding task where one must be proficient in translating whole text situations. Interaction of verbal and visual elements, intertextuality, symbology of typography and the meanings of colors, for instance, are features that translators encounter in picture books. Similarly, readability and the reading-aloud situation must not be overlooked either. (Oittinen 2004: 11—12, 40.) Translation of picture books, therefore, is not a mechanical process but a special field; it involves both thorough knowledge of language and culture, and mastery of verbal and visual literacy (Oittinen 2001a: 123).

Oittinen (2004: 10) points out that translated picture books do not enjoy high prestige in our society, at least if considered from a translator's point of view. The translator's name is not always mentioned in the book, and many publishers — and even fellow translators — consider translation of picture books merely as easy and fun recreation (Oittinen 2004: 10). The challenges of translating works where pictures and words are in inseparable symbiosis have not been taken seriously. Another problem is that no consensus exists among scholars on the definition of the picture book. Differing views concern the distinctive features of picture books and illustrated books, among others. (Oittinen 2004: 18.) However, it is important that the translator is aware of what kind of a book he is translating, but it is hard to cope without a definition. The translator also needs knowledge of different types of picture books in order to understand their unique features and learn how to handle them. (Oittinen 2004: 24.) Unfortunately, very little — if any — research has been made on the translation of alphabet books, which can be considered as something of a sub-type of the picture book. Most alphabet books — or ABC books — are targeted at emergent child readers with the aim of teaching them the letters of the alphabet. The books are illustrated and typically name and picture everyday objects in alphabetical sequence. (O'Sullivan 2010: 16.) The ABC books are relatively unvarying in format and they are short — often a maximum of 60 pages in length. The information relating to each letter ranges mostly from one-half to two pages, and many alphabet books concentrate on specific topics or themes. (Chaney 1993: 96—97.) Alphabet books can also utilize rhyming couplets or short poems (O'Sullivan 2010: 16).

Traditionally, ABC books are considered as aids in identifying letters and objects, but by incorporating more complex content, the books can benefit older readers as well (Chaney 1993: 96—97). In addition to the general problems of translating illustrated children's books, the ABC book offers its own, unique challenges for the translator. This thesis aims to shed light on the complexity of translating an ABC book from English into Finnish.

The subject will be approached by comparing *Richard Scarry's ABC Word Book* (1971) with its Finnish translation *ABC Kirja* (1974, 5th edition 2008). In chapter 2, the author and material will be introduced in more detail. The theoretical framework of this thesis consists of relevant studies made of children's literature and especially of picture books. In chapter 3, I shall explain some of the different views scholars of children's literature and translation have on this subject. The topic has been approached from many perspectives, including polysystems theory and dialogics. The other part of the theoretical framework focuses on a functional translation approach. Chapter 4 outlines the *skopos* theory formulated by Hans J. Vermeer in Reiss & Vermeer (2013). The *skopos* approach was chosen for this particular study because it offers a target text oriented view on the translation process. My hypothesis is that a literal translation approach is not possible due to the purpose (*skopos*) of the target text. In chapter 5, I shall conduct the analysis of the material and examine the results in the light of the theoretical framework. Finally, concluding remarks are drawn in chapter 6.

2 Author and material

Richard Scarry (1919—1994) was an American author, who was renowned for his illustrations and children's books. As a child, he was more interested in football and sketching than studying. His father owned a clothes store and hoped Scarry would follow his footsteps and become a businessman. Instead, Scarry wanted to pursue a career as an artist and began studying at the Boston's Museum of Fine Arts. (Retan & Risom 1997: 10, 12—13.)

Before Scarry began creating works for children, he was drafted to the army during The Second World War. During his service, Scarry was also able to visit several European countries, and he developed a life-long interest in traveling and sightseeing. Scarry's fondness of foreign cultures was also later reflected in his numerous children's books. After the war, however, Scarry returned to the United States and worked in an advertising agency and as a freelance illustrator (Retan & Risom 1997: 17, 21.)

Scarry's career as a children's author took off in 1949 with Little Golden Books. (Retan & Risom 1997: 26). The series was published in Finland under the name *Tammen kultaiset kirjat*. During his first years at Golden Books, Scarry was illustrating books by other writers, but in 1951 came out the first book which he had written and illustrated himself, *The Great Big Car and Truck Book* (Retan & Risom 1997: 32—33). While still carrying out illustrations mainly for other authors, Scarry was eagerly sketching his own ideas and stories. At the turn of 1960, he was able to convince the publishing house Doubleday of some of his ideas, which were published in 1960—1963. (Retan & Risom 1997: 47—48.) Meanwhile, Scarry began a new project of a different kind of a word book: a book that would sort words in categories instead of under a certain letter of the alphabet. The concept was eventually rejected by Doubleday. Scarry brought his sketches to his old publisher Golden Books, who believed in the idea. In 1963 the large-format book *Richard Scarry's Best Word Book Ever* was published, and it was the very first book to include the author's name as part of the title. The book quickly became very popular: by the end of 1975, the book had sold more than seven million copies. (Retan & Risom 1997: 49—50.) Since the book arranged the words by subject matter and not by the letter of the alphabet, it was easier to translate to foreign languages, which, in

turn, helped Scarry to conquer foreign markets (Retan & Risom 1997: 91). However, Scarry was dissatisfied with the royalties of Golden Books, and decided to look for better contract terms for his book *What Do People Do All Day?* He eventually teamed up with Random House, with whom he made a lucrative multi-book contract in 1967. (Retan & Risom 1997: 69, 71.)

In 1968, the author moved to Switzerland with his wife Patsy and son Huck. Scarry and Patsy remained in Switzerland for the rest of their lives, occasionally visiting the United States and traveling in other countries. (Retan & Risom 1997: 80, 99, 105, 113.) Scarry kept himself busy throughout the 1970's by creating more and more children's books. By the end of the next decade, the Scarry franchise had expanded to include films, toys and museum displays — although books remained the author's personal favorites. During the 1980's, Scarry began experiencing health problems. His eyesight became worse; he was suffering from macular degeneration, which causes progressive loss of vision. Scarry was also diagnosed with cancer of the esophagus, which was treated by operation and chemotherapy. Scarry died of a heart attack in his Gstaad home in April 30, 1994 at the age of 74. His wife Patsy passed away the next year. (Retan & Risom 1997: 116—118.)

During his productive career, Scarry illustrated over 150 books which have sold over 100 million copies worldwide. In addition, his books have been translated in over twenty languages. (www.randomhousekids.com/authors-illustrators/detail/520.) This indicates that his books are highly popular around the world, including Finland. Scarry's illustrations were very rich and detailed, since he did not like to leave a lot of white paper visible in his works. When creating pictures with plenty of details and spreads packed with action, Scarry made sure his books would offer funny moments time and time again. In addition, he wanted to renew the reading experience, so that there would be opportunities for the child to comment on the pictures and activities. Scarry would simulate dialogue between parents and children by adding questions and remarks which would highlight the illustrations. (Retan & Risom 1997: 121.)

Scarry drew his characters as animals, although for him they were not animals but real people doing their everyday tasks. Scarry believed that it was easier for children to identify with animal characters instead of humans. In addition, it was easier to avoid different cultural or ethnic features by substituting people with animals. In his

books, Scarry also promoted educational values, but not in a pedantic or didactic way. Many of his books taught children good manners and how to respect other people. (Retan & Risom 1997: 126, 130.)

The material used for this thesis consists of *Richard Scarry's ABC word book* (2001[1971]) and its Finnish translation *ABC kirja* (2008[1974]). *Richard Scarry's ABC Word Book* is an illustrated alphabet book consisting of 28 spreads (61 pages). It features many of the beloved Busytown characters introduced in Scarry's earlier works. Unlike Scarry's first big hit *Richard Scarry's Best Word Book Ever* (1963), *Richard Scarry's ABC word book* is a more traditional ABC book sorting out words by the alphabet. The book is composed of individual, illustrated spreads which contain small sections of text relating to the pictures. On every spread, there is a letter of the alphabet in the upper left corner, and this letter appears also in the text. The text can either be nouns, pronouns (i. e. 'hangar', 'traveler', 'Huckle'), phrases ('a tall lily plant') or complete sentences ('Hilda is running out of the way to safety', 'Watch out Mother Cat!'). The text depicts objects, things, persons or events in the illustrations. The letter in question has been highlighted with red color in the text whereas the rest of the letters in the words are black. The illustrations on each spread depict different scenes from traffic chaos and busy harbor to party and every day activities. The spreads act as independent "mini stories" so there is no continuing plot throughout the book. The illustrations are very typical Scarry; spreads full of pictures and action, lots of details and numerous characters. The text also contains questions and tasks for the reader to fulfil, which represents the kind of reading experience Scarry was eager to promote.

The English edition I am using was published by HarperCollins Publishers Ltd in 2001. I also had another edition of this book by Sterling Publishing, which was slightly larger in size and it had some adjustments made to the illustrations. The text did not differ markedly between the HarperCollins and Sterling editions; most differences were related to the distinctive features of British and American English. For instance, the word 'sidewalk' is 'pavement' in the British version, 'tire' is 'tyre' and 'plumber's truck' is replaced with 'plumber's van'. There are also few instances where the British edition has added a few words to the spreads, which do not appear in the Sterling edition. The differences, however, are quite small. In the illustrations,

there are a few changes made to the Sterling edition. On the very first spread, there is a passenger airplane with the name SWISSAIR painted on its side, and a Swissair logo on the plane's tail. These have been removed in the Sterling edition. Similarly, the HarperCollins edition features a red World War One type airplane, with symbols on the wings and tail resembling the insignia of the imperial German's military aircrafts (black cross). This plane appears on several spreads throughout the book. However, the symbols have been removed in the Sterling edition. I chose to use the HarperCollins edition because it was closer to the size of the Finnish edition, and because the Finnish version also features the above-mentioned details in the illustrations.

The Finnish translation *ABC kirja* was first published in 1974. The second edition was revised and published in 1981. The material I am studying in this thesis is the 5th edition, and it was published in 2008 by Tammi. Mervi Miettinen is mentioned as the translator of the book. The Finnish edition is slightly smaller in size when compared with the HarperCollins edition. However, the illustrations are exactly the same and the pages are in the same order as in the HarperCollins' edition. The Finnish text is written with a slightly smaller and different font, and the letters of the alphabet are bolded, not colored in red. The Finnish book also has page numbers, whereas the HarperCollins does not.

3 Children's literature and translation

Defining children's literature — or the concepts 'child' and 'childhood' — is not easy (Oittinen 2000: 4). The whole concept of children's literature is rather problematic, since we do not tend to speak of 'adult literature' either. Instead, we tend to speak of non-fiction, fiction, or poetry, sci-fi, fantasy, horror, crime and romantic novels, among others. Categorizing adult literature in different genres and sub-genres seems normal to us, but children's literature is often sold under the vague title 'children's literature' or 'children's and young people's literature'. Sometimes, we encounter children's books specified to certain age groups, to children's fact books or to picture books. Oittinen (2000: 65) notes how the same genres are employed in both children's and adults' literature, and therefore she does not regard children's literature *per se* as a separate genre. But how should we approach the literature that is so diverse and yet so difficult to define?

One simplified approach would be to state that everything in libraries' or book stores' children's book section should be viewed solely as children's literature (Oittinen 2004: 94). This classification may, however, seem too black-and-white, since books popular among adults are often sold as children's literature. On the other hand, children's literature is usually oriented towards a dual audience of both children and adults. Often the same book contains two different readings: a more demanding one for adults and a more understandable level for children. (Oittinen 2000: 64.) Multifaceted texts, such as Tove Jansson's *Moomin* books or Antoine de Saint-Exupéry's *The Little Prince*, open different interpretations for child and adult addressees. These books have a diffuse status, and they are more or less ambivalent texts that do not fall exclusively into one single category (Shavit 1986: 64—66).

One of the main tasks of children's literature is to educate the child and serve as a didactic tool. On the other hand, the books should be understandable and well-readable. However, often these expectations might be in conflict, and thus authors must consider whether the book should contain more difficult language so the child could expand his vocabulary, or should the text be plain and simple so the child could comprehend the story better. (Puurttinen 2000: 109.) It is also important to note, that children's literature can educate adults as well. Especially parents may identify with situations or relationships portrayed in children's books. Today's

mothers and fathers might be confused about the “do’s and don’ts” of parenting, since they are constantly encountering different upbringing methods and guides in the modern society. Children’s books may well offer sensible and practical models of upbringing for parents. (Heinimaa 2001: 148.)

Another starting point could be to examine children’s literature with respect to its producers or readers; a book can be classified as children’s literature if the author or producers have defined it as children’s literature (Oittinen 2004: 94). The very definition of children’s literature is often formulated on the basis of adults’ point of view, on how they see children in our society (Oittinen 2000: 68). Children’s literature is thus created on the basis of our child images. Child image is a dynamic concept that changes with time and with society. We cannot use a concept of universal childhood, nor can we consider children as a homogenous group (O’Sullivan 2005: 8). Authors and translators as well as whole societies have different notions of the child and childhood. These notions are represented in their child images, which shape what kind of literature is created for young readers. (Oittinen 2000: 4.)

Wall (1991: 1) speaks of “the genre of writing for children” instead of the difficult term children’s literature. She states (1991: 2) that “if a story is written *to* children, then it is *for* children, even though it may also be for adults”. However, a book does not belong to the genre of writing for children, if it is not specifically written *to* children (Wall 1991: 2). As mentioned above, Oittinen does not consider children’s literature as a genre. For her (2000: 4—5) children’s literature is literature that adults read aloud to children, and literature that is read by children themselves. Wall (1991: 2—3) utilizes the theory of narratology to examine the narrator-narratee relationship in fiction, which differs significantly between children’s and adults’ literature. The essential question is to whom something is said and in what manner; not *what* is said (Wall 1991: 2—3). Wall (1991: 14—15) states that the term “writing down” is often used in a negative sense, but she considers it natural that adults and children are unequal in skills, and writers to children must adapt the text for immature readers. O’Sullivan (2005: 12) points out that the most significant difference between general literature and children’s literature is the fact that latter is created particularly for children by adults, which results in an unequal communicative relationship between

the two. It is clear that children do not participate in determining their own literature, or what books are produced or translated for them. Children's literature exists because of adult actions; the preferences and decisions of adults shape what kind of literature is created for emergent readers. In other words, adults are exercising authority over children in the sphere of literature. (Oittinen 2000: 69.)

Some scholars also notice an asymmetrical power relationship between children's literature and general literature. Hunt (1992: 2) sees similarities between children's literature and the so-called "new" literature of feminist and post-colonial writers. These literatures have just recently entered the institutional map and begun to challenge the dominant culture. Similarly, in order to gain acceptance, children's literature had to struggle to rise from the shadow of academic hegemony. Just like the new literatures, it resists the hierarchy and classification of the prevailing system and challenges the traditional way of thinking. In addition, the overrepresentation of women in the field of children's literature emphasizes this inferior status even more. (Hunt 1992: 2.) Puurtinen (2000: 106) points out that children's literature has been subject to marginal interest amongst researchers as well as in the field of literature itself. This devaluation is evident in the lack of book reviews and in the separation of literature awards for children's and adults' literature. (Puurtinen 2000: 106.) Book reviews are especially useful in revealing the society's attitudes, norms and values; from children's book reviews, we can discover what kind of literature is regarded as "good for the children". This typically reflects the expectancy norms critics and readers affiliate with children's literature. Books that follow these norms usually receive positive feedback or no feedback at all, since good books are expected to comply with the prevailing standards. On the other hand, if a book breaks the norms, it often gets more negative reviews. (Puurtinen 2000: 124.) Shavit (1986: 35—36) adds that, unlike adult's literature, children's literature is often reviewed on educational rather than literary criteria. Children's literature is also constrained by the society's expectation that a children's book should simultaneously appeal to children and adults. (Shavit 1986: 37—38).

How does the translation of children's literature differ from any other literature? Should the problems of translating children's books be regarded as identical to those encountered in every translation process? Klingberg (1986: 10) argues that in many

respects the translation problems encountered in adult and children's literature are similar, but children's literature does entail its own, separate challenges. In the translation process of children's literature, the struggle between loyalty to the original and regard to the target text readers is emphasized because of conflicting educational aims. Some pedagogical views encourage close adherence to the source text, while others allow manipulation. Klingberg (1986: 10) states that the first category encompasses goals such as making more literature available for young readers and contributing to their worldview. However, children's knowledge of foreign cultures is fairly limited, which can result in change and deletion of text; the target text reader should be offered a translation that is consistent with his level of understanding. Secondly, pedagogical aims may be reflected in the desire to change and delete values regarded as inappropriate. (Klingberg 1986: 10.)

Venuti's (1995) concepts of domestication and foreignization have been employed by many scholars studying the translation of children's literature. Many of the translation problems encountered in children's literature concern culture-specific traits in the source text. Domestication refers to adapting the translation so that it is brought closer to the target reader's own culture. Foreignization, on the other hand, means leaving the source culture specific elements in the translation. According to Venuti (1995: 20), domestication should always be avoided, since it represents ethnocentrism and racism. He criticizes especially the domestication practice in the Anglo-American culture, and sees foreignization as a means to strive against the dominant target culture values of the English-speaking world by bringing forward the foreignness of the source text. (Venuti 1995: 21, 23.) Venuti (1995: 20, 305) refers to foreignization as *resistancy* that suppresses the culture specific values that typically guide reading and translation processes and that tend to result in the minoritizing of a foreign text. *Invisibility* is a term that refers to the way translators tend to translate fluently in order to produce an idiomatic and "readable" target text. A fluent translation disguises itself as "the original" by appearing "natural" and, thus, not translated. This approach generates an illusion of an "invisible" translator. (Venuti 1995: 1, 5.) O'Sullivan (2006[1998]: 121) notes how, instead of considering the translator as an agent in the text, we tend to discuss of "changes", "omissions" or "additions". However, the translator's supposed invisibility is in fact an illusion, since every translation has a new implied reader and a new narrator (O'Sullivan

2006[1998]: 121). Lathey (2006: 1) adds that translators of children's books are less likely to receive recognition for their work than translators of adult literature. The fact that the names of children's book translators are more often left unmentioned seems to indicate that the books have been "transposed from one language to another by some kind of literary osmosis with no human agent involved" (Lathey 2006: 1—2). However, the translator is there. His presence can be seen in the translated text itself: in the linguistic choices, adaptations, omissions and additions he has made. (Lathey 2006: 2.)

Klingberg (1986: 11) uses the term *adaptation*, which in principle means the same as domestication. He (1986: 11) notes that the supposed interests, needs, knowledge and reading ability of the intended audience greatly influence what kind of literature is written to children. The way authors and publishers take them into account and how they are displayed in the completed works is called adaptation (Klingberg 1986: 11). This *degree of adaptation* is important and it should be preserved in the translation as well. However, children's fiction often contains cultural elements that are more familiar to the source text readers than to the target text readers due to their different cultural background. If the translator fails to pay attention to this problem, the target text will have a lower degree of adaptation than the source text. The translation can, thus, become too complex to comprehend or the reader might lose interest in the book. If the translator is to preserve the degree of adaptation, he may believe that an additional adaptation is necessary for the target text readers. This kind of *cultural context adaptation* occurs when the source text contains cultural elements alien in the target culture. The translator's aim is then to make the reading experience more effortless and interesting through manipulation. (Klingberg 1986: 11—12.) One type of cultural context adaptation is *localization*, where the cultural setting of the source text is changed to a more familiar location in the target text (Klingberg 1986: 15—18). When the target text is adjusted to comply with target culture values, Klingberg prefers the term *purification*. *Modernization*, on the other hand, is a process where the text is brought closer to the present by replacing outdated expressions with more modern language. (Klingberg 1986: 11—12.) Klingberg (1986: 57—59) notes that modernization and purification are contentious issues, and especially the latter implies an overprotective stance towards children.

Klingberg (1986: 17) strongly argues that cultural context adaptation should be employed only when it is absolutely necessary and preferably in cases of details. He (1986: 17) states that the target text should be subordinate to the source text, and all manipulation should be reduced to the minimum. I find this view problematic, since who is to decide when adaptation is necessary or not. Is it the translator, the publisher, the original author or the reader, who makes the decision? Nevertheless, Klingberg (1986: 18—19) lists nine ways to affect cultural context adaptation. If adaptation is necessary, added explanation, rewording, explanatory translation or explanation outside the text can be considered. Substitution of a target language equivalent or rough equivalent, simplification, deletion and localization, however, are not recommended since they violate the source text. (Klingberg 1986: 18—19.) However, Klingberg (1986: 19) stresses that in some cases the translator may have to resort to the strategies in the latter category. Every passage presents its own translation challenges, and it is impossible to form all-encompassing rules that apply in every instance (Klingberg 1986: 19).

Another viewpoint arises from the appreciation of children's literature and its position in the literary polysystem. Children's literature has been pushed to the periphery in the literary system because of its uncanonical nature and culturally marginalized status (O'Connell 2006[1999]: 18). This is partly due to the fact that children's books often resist traditional literary norms and classification. The inferior status of children's books is also reflected in the authors' low pay. (O'Connell 2006[1999]: 19.) As a result of the marginal position, the translator can adapt the target text more freely, since other factors take precedence over faithfulness to the original (Puurtilinen 2006[1994]: 54). Shavit (1986) draws her guidelines of translation and manipulation from this marginal status. She (1986: x) views children's literature as a part of a stratified system which is influenced by socioliterary constraints. In children's literature, especially the educational and ideological spheres shape our attitudes towards children's books (Shavit 1986: xi). According to Shavit (1986: 114), the translator of a children's book has to follow two sets of translation principles. Firstly, the text needs to be adapted to suit the society's prevailing educational norms in order to be suitable and practical for the young reader. On the other hand, the story, characterization and language should conform to the society's view on children's reading abilities and level of comprehension.

Nowadays, the second principle has gained more significance, but both principles shape the translation process, such as the texts chosen for translation as well as the level of manipulation employed in translation. (Shavit 1986: 113.) According to Shavit (1986: 115), these principles are also reflected in the restrictive norms that guide the translator's approach towards children's literature in the polysystem. Firstly, translations need to be compatible with existing models in the target system, since children's literature usually only embraces the models it already recognizes as conventional and familiar. This means that a satire — such as *Gulliver's Travels* — can be turned into a fantasy tale if satire is an unknown model in the children's literature of the target system. (Shavit 1986: 115—117.) Similarly, changes and deletions are acceptable if some parts are not compatible with the prevailing moral values or children are not expected to understand them (Shavit 1986: 122—123). Complexity of the text or characterization can also result in adaptation. Shavit (1986: 125—126) herself notes how the complex world of *Alice in Wonderland* was simplified in the translations to make a clear distinction between dream and reality. Stylistic and ideological norms are also important and may result in the alteration of the text content. For instance, *Robinson Crusoe's* German translation (1779—80) by Joachim Campe was influenced by Rousseau's pedagogic views, which resulted in the rejection of the bourgeois and colonialist values of the original. (Shavit 1986: 126—128.)

According to Stolt (2006[1978]: 69), translation theory of children's literature has rejected the fundamental argument of faithfulness to the original text, which for many years played an important role in the translation discourse. Stolt (2006[1978]: 71) names three cases where faithfulness is replaced by other interests in children's literature. Firstly, educational intentions may override faithfulness to the original if the source text includes elements seen as unsuitable. For instance, children behaving in radical ways are portrayed as exemplary children in the translation. Secondly, adults' perceptions of what children prefer and understand can result in the underrating of children and produce tame or pale translations. Adults' presuppositions about children as readers can lead to too effortless translations, which do not broaden the children's worldview. Lastly, some translators may end up sentimentalizing and prettifying the text if they attempt to “improve” or change the style of the original. (Stolt 2006[1978]: 71—77.) However, Stolt (2006[1978]: 71)

emphasizes that it is not always the translator, who is responsible for the target text — the publisher's role and influence must be considered as well. However, she concludes that children's and adult's literature should be treated according to the same principle: "the endeavour should be a translation as faithful, as equivalent as possible" (Stolt 2006[1978]: 82).

Oittinen (2000: 5—6) states that in the translation discourse the definition of adaptation often deals with the ways in which a work deviates from the original. Some scholars think that translations are about producing sameness, and adaptation is then seen as something different. Other scholars react negatively to adaptation, since they think it pedagogizes and denatures children's literature. (Oittinen 2000: 74.) Adaptations are compared to the originals and often regarded as inferior in value (Oittinen 2000: 76). However, Oittinen (2000: 5—6) notes that the concepts of adaptation and equivalence are not clearly defined. She (2000: 5—6) does not take them to be separate phenomena, since adaptation is an inevitable part of every translation process, and all translations include alteration and domestication. It is not possible to unequivocally distinguish translation and adaptation from one another; the distinction is only rooted in our thoughts and attitudes (Oittinen 2000: 80). Oittinen (2000: 82) does acknowledge that it is not entirely unjustified to be concerned about adapting children's literature, since warning examples from the past do exist. The pedagogic interests of adults and the likes and needs of children do not always go hand in hand, and when in conflict, the authority of the adult usually wins. However, the negative attitude towards adaptation arises from a (false) assumption of what happens in the translation process — from the idea that the author has taken into account the readers' expectations, and thus the translator's duty is to remain "faithful" to the source text. This approach considers precision and equivalence as ideal and, therefore, as respect towards the original text. However, it fails to provide adequate solutions to the problems regarding equivalence and alteration, or the source text's status in the translation process. (Oittinen 2000: 82.) Translation and adaptation cannot to be described as opposite strategies, since they are, in fact, interrelated phenomena: translation always involves adaptation of texts, for its aim is to meet specific purposes and reach certain audiences. In this respect, domestication is not a separate method, but an integral part of every translation process. Instead, we

should shift our focus to how translations function in authentic situations. (Oittinen 2000: 83—84.)

Oittinen (2000: 85) criticizes Klingberg's approach of focusing on isolated text fragments and words as well as his attempt to form strict guidelines for translators. Klingberg keeps focusing on the microlevel of translation without moving beyond to the macrolevel (Oittinen 2000: 98). Oittinen (2000: 3) emphasizes that "translators never translate words in isolation, but whole situations". She (2000: 91) believes that it should be completely acceptable to write a modernized translation — for instance — where the story and setting are placed in the present culture of the target audience, as long as it is carried out consistently and bearing in mind the perspective of the intended readers. Instead of classifying adaptation and domestication into the categories 'good' and 'bad', the questions that should be focused on are "the purpose of the whole translation project, the translator's child image and the translation situation" (Oittinen 2000: 91). Oittinen (2000: 97) also criticizes Klingberg for implying that the translator's task is merely to replicate the original author's aims, and that he is not to make decisions regarding domestication or foreignization in different situations based on his own expertise. Klingberg's term adaptation means that the producer of the source text has already considered the likes, needs and skills of his readers, and therefore the translator should merely follow the source text. As we have seen, this conception is problematic since it turns precision and equivalence into attainable ideals. (Oittinen 2000: 82, 89.) It also implies that the author's words are "authoritarian" as such, and if the translation fails to adhere to these words, it is to be called an adaptation (Oittinen 2000: 98).

In addition, Oittinen (2000: 81) does not agree with Shavit's view that a text's meaning is in the text itself, and this meaning will stay the same if the translator does not change or distort it through manipulation. However, readers in different situations react to texts in various, individual ways, and construct their own interpretation chains which then bring the text to life in novel perspectives (Oittinen 2000: 15). In this respect, there is no 'one meaning' or 'one text'; both are (re)interpretation in a certain situation (Oittinen 2000: 81). Oittinen (2000: 85) also notes that Shavit does not accept adaptation because she sees it as a sign of unappreciation of children's literature. Similarly, by focusing on text systems and

polysystems, Shavit fails to contemplate translation as part of a greater whole, always involving a translation situation and a child reader (Oittinen 2000: 85, 98). According to Oittinen (2000: 99), Klingberg and Shavit adopt a critical stance towards adaptation, since for them it indicates disrespect for children and thus they view it as a harmful issue *per se*. For them, translation equals the original, but they fail to understand that translations too employ adaptation and domestication to some degree (Oittinen 2000: 99). In fact, a successful translator must adapt the target text for his intended readers (Oittinen 2000: 78).

Oittinen (2000: 69) notes that rather than speaking of translating children's literature we should discuss about translating for children, since translators always aim their work at somebody and their translations have specific purposes. Translating for children, thus, means creating something for a specific audience, while constantly bearing in mind their wishes and abilities throughout the process (Oittinen 2000: 69). However, O'Connell (2006[1999]: 17) states that some producers of children's literature may be too estranged from the world of children, or they simply fail at being convincing in the eyes of their readers. Unfortunately, sometimes authors focus on fulfilling the needs and wishes of critics, parents and teachers at the expense of their primary audience — children (O'Connell 2006[1999]: 17). Authors may face a dilemma as children's literature must gain acceptance from both children and adults. Similarly, the translator has to acknowledge this dual audience, but he must also take into consideration the target reader's expectations, the status of the source text and the cultural norms of translation. (Puurtilinen 2006[1994]: 54.)

Oittinen (2006[1995]) herself emphasizes the reader's, the child's and translator's point of view. The translation is shaped by the translator's own reading experience, and therefore the translation becomes a completely new text and not a mere reproduction of the source text. Oittinen (2006[1995]: 84—85, 89) adopts Bakhtin's ideas of dialogism and carnivalism as the core of her study. In order to bring the translation to life, the translator must enter into dialogue with the original text, with the child reader and his own child image, and produce a translation that appeals to the primary audience. Furthermore, children's culture can be compared to carnivalism; due to its non-official nature, it has no authority or rules to follow; it breaks norms and addresses the subjects shunned by adults. (Oittinen 2006[1995]:

85— 86.) However, adults should learn to acknowledge the value of this carnivalistic world and realize its potential. Carnivalism allows us to communicate without etiquette through non-authoritative communication. Translators should abandon their patronizing attitudes and enter the children's carnival with an open mind, explore it with children and learn from it. This mutual dialogue may give rise to new interpretations where respect for the original is achieved. (Oittinen 2006[1995]: 87, 89.)

A thought, a sentence, a text, a picture — they are all involved in a never-ending, carnivalistic dialogue [...] In different reading situations, readers interpret these signs in a various ways — they turn away from what they read — depending on the situation itself, which involves the text, interpreter, time, place, and so on. Translating, too, always includes the act of turning away from the original, which is the starting point for a new, fearless interpretation based on the translator-reader's reading experience. All this makes translating rewriting, alteration and positive manipulation. (Oittinen 2006[1995]: 96—97.)

The translated text should not be viewed as “a text” but rather as a whole text situation (Oittinen 2000: 81). When a translator translates an illustrated work, such as a picture book, the dialogic situation expands and becomes more polyphonic. In addition to the writer's and illustrator's voice, the translator adds his own voice to the situation. (Oittinen 2004: 93.) Translators should not ignore these aspects in the translation process, but rather cooperate through dialogue. However, the translation's dialogic situation always involves the translator's individuality and reading experience, and these cannot be taken away. Responsibility towards both the author of the original as well as towards the target audience can be achieved through dialogue. In addition, there is also a third type of responsibility: the translator's responsibility towards himself and to his child image. However, there is no need to believe that regard to the “rights” of the author contradicts the “rights” of the readers, or vice versa. When writing, or adapting, texts for children, authors consider their target audience carefully. Similarly, translators — drawing on their perspective, culture and language — adapt these texts and bring something new to the dialogic situation. A translation that lives on in the target audience is a sign of loyalty to the original author as well. Loyalty is thus something beyond mere words or text; loyalty means respect for the whole story-telling situation interpreted for new readers. (Oittinen 2000: 84.)

3.1 The picture book — translating two media

Illustrations are also a distinct feature of children's literature (Oittinen 2000: 4—5.) One type of illustrated book is often termed as the picture book. However, as with the concept children's literature, scholars have different views on its definition. One might say that all children's books containing illustrations are picture books, while others might conclude that picture books differ from view books, story books, fact books and audio books. According to Nodelman (1988: vii), picture books are books for young children with the aim of conveying information or telling stories by employing a series of pictures that are combined with relatively little text or no text at all. Oittinen (2004: 35) considers the picture book as an *iconotext*; it is composed as a series of words and images, where both forms of storytelling must be taken into consideration (Oittinen borrows the term 'iconotext' from Hallberg 1982). Although some picture books — like Raymond Briggs' *The Snowman*, 1978 — are wordless, they still tell a story with illustrations (Oittinen 2004: 27).

Lewis (2001: 77) notes that picture books are a child's first contact to the world of literature. Small children do not yet acknowledge how picture books are used, but this literature acts as an educational tool and introduces them the function of the picture book (Lewis 2001: 77). Similarly Nodelman (1988: 22) notes that a baby — handling a book for the first time — must learn its distinct function: the book is not meant to be tasted, chewed or squeezed, but looked at. Moreover, the book is to be looked at in a specific way; it has a front and a back, an up and a down, the pages are meant to be turned one at a time in a correct sequence (Nodelman 1988: 22). The pictures also have an important function since they are often a child's first contact to a visual language, art (Heinimaa 2001: 155). The illustrations enable the child to play an active role in the reading situation even though he is not yet able to read. By looking at the pictures the child is able to grasp the story and its world. (Launis 2001: 69.) Unfortunately, the study of children's literature mainly focuses on the verbal text instead of the visual, although there is a great need for the study of pictures too (Heinimaa 2001: 144). Illustrations are of great importance in books aimed especially at small children, since the books from our childhood often shape our ideas of fairy tales, castles, princes and princesses for life. Not to mention that high quality illustrations can significantly attribute to the success of the book. (Stolt

2006[1978]: 78.) In picture books, the relationship between illustrations and words is often carefully designed. It is also worth noting that the text's visual appearance, typography, is an integral part of the work's visual world. In some books, the typeface and font size can even play a key role in the interpretation of the story. (see for example Oittinen 2004: 79—83.)

Oittinen (2004: 25) emphasizes that a picture book does not usually fit neatly into one category. Often the same book might entertain the child reader and provide factual information at the same time. Picture books can also combine several techniques from prose and lyric to dialogue and indirect narration. What is typical to most picture books is that they contain simple language that resembles speech. (Oittinen 2004: 27.) The pictures and words are never, however, “the same” or “a different” thing. Even though the pictures seem to repeat what has been mentioned in the verbal text, the visual factor always brings something new to the story. The power of illustration lies especially in its ability to explain in details — even when the illustrations are plain and simple. (Lewis 2001: 39.) The pictures and words open two, sometimes even contradictory worlds for the reader. The picture book is in fact an elliptic text, where neither the text nor the pictures can stand alone as the vehicle of storytelling, but they both add something new to the whole. (Oittinen 2004: 52.)

Lewis (2001: 28) states that the form of the picture book should be regarded as somewhat unbounded, although not all illustrated works should be defined as picture books. He suggests that we should adopt an inclusive approach towards picture books instead of an exclusive one; a new book should be compared with other works already accepted as picture books and look for similarities. The relationship between the pictures and words cannot be the sole basis for definition, since wordless picture books also exist. (Lewis 2001: 28.) Because picture books are incredibly diverse and heterogenetic in form, it is useful to relate them to one another by searching for family resemblances (Lewis 2001: 44).

Lewis (2001: 48) also encourages us to view the picture book in ecological terms. He sees the picture book as having an internal ecosystem. The pictures form the context, or environment, where the text can come to life and vice versa. This ecological approach also allows a degree of flexibility: the word and image — like an organism and environment — constantly influence one another, but the relationship between

them may not remain static throughout the book. (Lewis 2001: 48—49.) Some picture books are interwoven in a more complex way, where changes to the textual or visual aspects will weaken the narrative, while others tend to be more flexible in this relation (Lewis 2001: 47). The words and pictures in a picture book are not ‘only words and pictures’, but words and pictures that live and function in the environment they have created (Lewis 2001:74). Thus, in the book’s ecosystem, the words and pictures interanimate each other; the text and images as such are imperfect and unfinished, the other is waiting for the other to complete it (Lewis 2001: 51, 74).

Lewis (2001: 65) emphasizes that the picture book is not a genre but rather it exploits genres. It is

a form that incorporates, or ingests, genres, forms of language and forms of illustration, then accommodates itself to what it has swallowed, taking something of the character of the ingested matter, but always inflected through the interanimation of the words and pictures (Lewis 2001: 65).

The picture book, thus, has countless possibilities, and this re-invention potential is what makes it so flexible. When society changes with time, the genres mutate as well and with them the picture book gets reshaped. It is impossible to say, what form the picture book will take in the future since it is constantly evolving and never completed. Asymmetry between words and pictures also open endless possibilities: the author can make the word and pictures walk different paths. (Lewis 2001: 66, 74.)

Nikolajeva and Scott (2001) also explore the interactive relationship between words and images, and find different dynamics within picture books. In their opinion, a *symmetrical* interaction occurs when the words and pictures tell the same story and repeat information in both media, thus leaving only very little to the imagination (Nikolajeva & Scott 2001: 12—14). In a *complementary* relationship, the pictures and words support each other by conveying information that the other one lacks. Sometimes this new information is restricted only to minor details, but when the words clearly expand the pictures or vice versa, it results in a more complex dynamics. (Nikolajeva & Scott 2001: 15—16.) However, when the words and images provide alternative information, the dynamics shift to *enhancing*. In an enhancing picture book, the verbal narrative alone cannot convey all the essential information — it needs the visual elements alongside the text to be meaningful.

Counterpointing strategy evokes several possible interpretations and stimulates the reader's imagination; he must make an effort in order to realize what is happening. Sometimes words and pictures may even be in opposition to one another, which challenges the reader to pay close attention to both forms of storytelling. (Nikolajeva & Scott 2001: 12, 17—21.)

Lewis (2000: 55) stresses that the picture book and its ecology can only come to life in the reading experience. The story takes shape somewhere between the reader and the text; the text offers a guideline for the reader to follow, but does not dictate the response. When children learn to read, they also become acquainted with the narrative conventions of children's literature and are able to use their knowledge of the world in this context (Lewis 2001: 55, 57—58.) A shared reading moment with an adult also develops the emotional life of a child. The experience of closeness and being heard shape the child's identity; he feels that he is important and his ideas matter. (Heinimaa 2001: 161.) Oittinen (2004: 35) emphasizes the theatrical nature of the picture book — it is performed and experienced, and has its own expressive language. In fact, theater and films have many things in common with picture books, and thus translating illustrated works for small children can be compared to the translating for theatre and film. Both forms of translation require that special attention is paid to the readability of the text. Sometimes they may even contain musical elements such as songs or poems, which must also be taken into consideration. In addition, the illustrations of a picture book function in a similar manner as the setting in a theatre. (Oittinen 2001a: 122.)

Lewis (2001: 78—79) also emphasizes the role of play in learning to read, since play is a natural element in the child's learning process. In the picture book, there is no fixed notion of what it should be like, since picture book authors are creating literature that is flexible and adaptable, and whose primary readership does not yet possess detailed expectations of what a book should contain. (Lewis 2001: 78—79.) Writers and illustrators can therefore break the rules and stretch conventions: the picture book can answer the child's desire for play through game-like text. Another kind of example of the relationship between play and picture books can be found in books that incorporate pop-ups, flaps and other types of engaging activities, which blur the line between games or toys and conventional books. (Lewis 2001: 81—82.)

Oittinen (2001a: 123) emphasizes that the translation of picture books is not only translation of texts. Translators need to be aware of the media they are translating for and bear it in mind through the whole translation process. It is not enough that the translator can read textual elements — he needs to learn to interpret graphic elements as well. (Oittinen 2001a: 123.) Although the translator cannot change the illustrations in the translation, he must understand why the pictures are there and what their purpose is (Oittinen 2004: 64). Texts are never closed or completely finished; they are open formats where individual parts and the whole shape one another. Since illustrations are important constituents of this whole, translators of picture books must develop and refine their visual literacy skills. (Oittinen 2000: 101.) In addition to the text and illustrations, readability and reading-aloud situation needs to be taken into account. Since picture books are often targeted at viewing and listening children under school age, their translations should similarly consider the reading-aloud situation and the visual elements from this perspective (Oittinen 2004: 95). The text has to be fluent so that it is easy for a parent or a child to read aloud, and the illustrations have to support the text and vice versa (Oittinen 2001a: 122).

When translating a picture book, it is particularly important to pay attention to the relationship between words and pictures. In this respect, illustrations are a double-edged sword; they may restrict the translator's choices, or they may offer valuable clues and inspiration. If the picture seems inconsistent with the textual expression, the reader is likely to pay attention to this contradiction which impedes the reading experience (Oittinen, 2004: 97). Illustrations may prove challenging, if the translator wishes to adapt or manipulate the target text in some way. For instance, culture specific elements are hard to avoid when they are present in the pictures. On the other hand, the pictures may sometimes provide clues for the translator; the visual elements may help him in choosing the most felicitous equivalents. The illustrations also help the translator to grasp the overall impression of the book and the feeling of the story (Oittinen 2004: 114, 124—125).

However, the visual world of a picture book does not consist merely of the illustrations; it also covers such aspects as typography, layout and cover art. All these factors have an impact on the reading experience, and it is important that the translator considers the individual parts in relation to the whole work. Thus, these

aspects should not be overlooked in a translation process, although they pose a different kind of a challenge than, for example, fitting the verbal text to a restricted space. (Oittinen 2001b: 140.) In addition, the translator should recognize hermeneutic gaps. In a picture book, it is common that the author does not tell everything to the reader explicitly, but that the reader fills the information gaps with his own interpretation. Since translators are used to making unclear expressions more explicit, they might miss these important interpretation gaps. (Oittinen 2001c: 168—169.) O’Sullivan (2006[1998]: 114) points out the same problem in picture books. Picture books are a forum where two media interact, which causes challenges for a translator. These problems become particularly troublesome when the pictures and words are in a very complicated, inseparable interplay. He says (2006[1998]: 114) that translators encounter difficulties especially in cases where the pictures and words seem walk different paths or where the text does not consistently relate to observations made from the pictures. The illustrations have a tendency of stimulating the translator’s linguistic abilities, and as a result, he might explicitly verbalize implicit elements of the pictures in the narrative. Thus, the translator might accidentally or deliberately fulfil intentional source text gaps in the target text. (O’Sullivan 2006[1998]: 114.)

4 *Skopos* theory

As noted above, Oittinen (2000) emphasizes how the translations are always aimed at somebody and how they have specific purposes; the situation of the reader is extremely important. Additionally, she emphasizes how the translator's interpretation of the text shapes the translation process. In many aspects, Oittinen's ideas are quite similar to those outlined by Reiss and Vermeer (2013).

Reiss and Vermeer's (2013) approach to translation theory is essentially a functional one, and emphasizes the purpose (*skopos*) of the target text (*translatum*) as the determining factor in a translation process (*translational action*). Reiss and Vermeer (2013: 54) go even further in suggesting that a text should not be viewed as 'a text', but as a particular text received and interpreted by a translator. Interpretation is a dynamic process, and it is possible that a 'text' changes during this process. A text only comes into being when it is received in a certain situation; no universal text as such exists. (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 81.) After the interpretation, the text is then produced in a certain manner, and thus the way the translator interprets the source text is a key factor in the translation process. Another significant aspect is the suitable function chosen by him, since the source text and its translation may serve different purposes due to cultural reasons. (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 53.) "*Translational action* presupposes the comprehension, i.e. the interpretation of the 'text' as object in a situation. *Translational action*, therefore, is not only linked to meaning but to sense: what somebody means to say." (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 54.) Regardless of the function that each *translatum* serves, they can be explored as information offers from one language and culture to another language and culture. (Reiss and Vermeer 2013: 69.)

According to Reiss and Vermeer (2013: 18), the starting point of each *translational action* is a given text, which the translator interprets. *Translational action* prerequisites the existence of a previously produced source text from which the target text can be produced for another culture. In Reiss and Vermeer's theory, the text is conceived as "a piece of information offered to a recipient by a text producer". (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 17—18.) When the producer of the source text creates his text, he is offering information to a particular target audience. This creation process is influenced by the expectations he has about the recipients and their situations.

Consequently, the translator's target text also offers a piece of information, but this time to a new set of recipients. After the translator has 'received' the source text, he — guided by the expectations he has about the intended audience — produces a *translatum* in which he informs the target recipients about the source text offer of information. It is inevitable that the source and target text producers offer information in different ways, because they have distinct expectations about their respective recipients, who belong to different cultures and language communities. (Reiss and Vermeer [1984]2013: 113.) The translator as one of the receivers of the text chooses the items he considers to be useful and adequate for a particular purpose. The translator then transfers these "informational items" to the target culture in a manner he deems suitable for achieving this purpose. (Nord 1997: 25—26.) Therefore, in Reiss and Vermeer's view, "a *translatum* may be considered a text offering information in a particular way about another offer of information" (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 18).

The production of a text takes place in a certain situation and context, and that process is guided by the desire to achieve a purpose. Some purposes are more specific than others, but they are always actions that involve other persons. However, there are several internal and external circumstances that influence our actions in a given situation. Therefore, whether our communication efforts are successful or not depend on the situation they are performed in — not anything can be said or written at a certain time and place, since our message requires a certain context in order to be understood properly. The producer and recipient of the text have their own socio-cultural communities as well as their own personal histories, and the production and reception of texts is affected by these individual constraints as well as the specific context of the communicative event. (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 17.)

Reiss and Vermeer (2013: 71) state that this idea of information offer is also helpful in answering the fundamental question of domestication and foreignization. A translation can be called foreignizing when it focuses on informing the recipients about the source text forms. Consequently, a domesticating translation emphasizes the information offer of text meaning and effect. (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 71.)

Translational action necessitates a particular target situation, from which the function and translation strategy of the target text can be derived. Therefore, the recipient's

situation — and hence the target culture and language — are the factors that ultimately determine the translation's offer of information. (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 74.) The relevance and appropriateness of a given information offer should be assessed in relation to the recipient's situation — only then can it be decided whether or not it is meaningful to offer that information (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 75). Again, the situation of the recipient is actually the translator's notion about a group of recipients and their situation. These expectations affect the translational action, since the translator translates bearing in mind the form and function in which the target culture expects the information to be offered. (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 76—77.) The translator's role in the process of translational action is of great significance because, in the end, he is the one who decides which texts are translated, when they are translated and in what manner. These decisions are based on his knowledge of the source and target cultures and languages. (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 78.) Optimally, the client should give as detailed information about the *skopos* as possible. If the client is unable to provide sufficient information about the aim of the translation due to lack of knowledge about target culture conditions, the translator as an expert of intercultural action must negotiate with the client and find an optimal solution. (Vermeer 1989: 183—184.) Oittinen (2000: 76) questions the concept of 'client' in children's literature, since she considers it as ambiguous; it can refer to the child, to the publisher, or even to the parent. To whom must the translator then be loyal to? Adaptations, for instance, might be written because translators want to be loyal to their child readers. (Oittinen 2000: 76.)

A translational action is governed by its purpose, which means that the act itself is always subordinate to the *skopos* of the action — i. e. the purpose determines what is done and how it is done. Therefore, the aim of achieving the translation's purpose should override the requirement that the translation process be carried out in a specific way. (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 85, 89.) According to Reiss and Vermeer (2013: 90) this *skopos* rule is the highest rule of a theory of translational action: the purpose determines the action:

The highest rule of a theory of translational action is the '*skopos* rule': any action is determined by its purpose, i.e. it is a function of its purpose or *skopos* (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 90).

This rule aims to put an end to the fundamental dispute concerning free vs. literal translation, since the *skopos* of the translation sets the requirement of how the translation is to be executed. ‘Free’ translation might be necessary for the achievement of a certain *skopos*, while another *skopos* might require a ‘literal’ translation approach. (Nord 1997: 29.) Secondly, there is the sociological aspect involved in translational action. The *skopos* of a given text is dependent on the text’s recipient:

Consequently, we can arrive at the following sub-rule for the *skopos* rule: The *skopos* can be described as a variable of the intended recipient (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 90).

The translator must be able to define and evaluate the target audience — otherwise it is impossible to choose a *skopos* for the translation. Knowledge of the target audience is important, since the relevance of a certain function can be determined only in relation to the recipients’ situation. Additionally, sometimes it is worth reassessing the suitability of some source text aspects in relation to the chosen *skopos*. The *skopos* can be achieved, when the translator considers the expectations of the intended readers and transfers the source text accordingly. (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 91— 92.) It is important to remember that a “good translation” is not always the one that complies with or adjusts to target culture behavior, since users may sometimes need philological or literal translations (Nord 1997: 29).

It is also entirely possible that the *translatum* adopts a different *skopos* than the source text, since translating and producing a source text are two completely different actions. Thus, a translational action may be directed at distinct purposes. Maintaining the source text’s purpose is not a definite precondition of every translational action but rather a phenomenon dependent on culture. (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 92.) Munday (2008: 80) praises the *skopos*-theory for this possibility to produce different translations of the same source text depending on the commission and purpose of the target text. Oittinen (2000: 12) thinks that the source text and the target text can never have the same *skopos*, since the readers of the original and the readers of the translation have different situations due to their distinct languages and cultures.

Thus, we have arrived to the concluding remarks of *skopos* theory. Firstly, “a translational action is a function of its *skopos*” (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 94). In

addition, a translational action is an offer of information for a situation in the target culture, and it is always based on a previous offer of information produced for a source culture situation. The target text's information offer "simulates" the source text's information offer, but not in a "biuniquely" reversible way. (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 94.)

General rules for translational action

- (1) A *translatum* is determined by its *skopos*.
- (2) A *translatum* is an offer of information in a target culture and language about an offer of information in a source culture and language.
- (3) A *translatum* is a unique, irreversible mapping of a source-culture offer of information.
- (4) A *translatum* must be coherent in itself.
- (5) A *translatum* must be coherent with the source text.
- (6) These rules are interdependent and linked hierarchically in the order set out above.

(Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 107)

Rule (3) implies that the translator — guided by the commission — chooses some items from the source offer of information, and then transfers them to a new information offer in the target culture (Nord 1997: 32). It also implies that a back-translation of the *translatum* is highly unlikely to reproduce the source text information offer, and thus the translation process can be considered irreversible (Nord 1997: 32). The coherence rule (4) means that the translation should be intratextually coherent, since the target audience must be able to comprehend the text. Therefore, the *translatum* should be consistent with the recipients' situation. The intertextual coherence rule (5), on the other hand, states that the translation should be coherent with the source text. This rule could also be referred to as the fidelity rule: there must be at least some kind of connection between the source text and target text. As the target text is an offer of information about another offer of information, some kind of relationship between the two should, by default, exist. However, the form this relationship takes is influenced by the translator's interpretation of the source text as well as by the *skopos* he has set for the translation. (Nord 1997: 32.) The rules are in a hierarchical order, where highest priority is given to the intended *skopos*. Therefore, if the *skopos* necessitates intratextual incoherence rule (4) is no longer valid. Such could be the case when translating the theater of the

absurd. (Nord 1997: 33.) The hierarchical order (6) implies that loyalty to the source text is seen as the least important criteria in translation.

Adherence to the source text should no longer be considered as the guiding principle in translation. The translator's work should only be governed by the desire to fulfil the *skopos* — the communicative purpose of the translation. The theory's strength lies in moving the focus away from the author and source text by giving the translator more freedom. The source text and equivalence are not the defining features of translation, unless they are regarded as necessary for the achievement of the purpose. (Pym 2010: 44—45.) Thus, *skopos* theory does not exclude faithful or even word-for-word translations. In addition, as the purpose is now at the center of the translation process, the *skopos* theory accepts adaptations, manipulations and abridgments to the realm of translation. Maintaining equivalence in the sense of sameness between source and target text should not be regarded as prerequisite if the starting point in translation is the target culture audience (Oittinen 2000: 12).

5 Analysis

I shall now move on to discuss the case study of *Richard Scarry's ABC Word Book* and its Finnish translation *ABC kirja* in relation to the theoretical framework set out above. This chapter is divided into four subchapters. First, I shall define the *skopos* of the translation (5.1). In the second subchapter, attention is paid to the localization of the letters of the alphabet (5.2). Then I shall discuss the translation problems caused by the letters and illustrations in more detail (5.3). Lastly, the narrator—narratee interaction will be explored in 5.4, and the domestication of character names and individual text pieces is the subject of subchapter 5.5. In the text examples below, the given alphabet is always bolded. In addition, when I am referring to the example's page number, it is the page number in the target text, since the source text lacks page numbers.

5.1 *Skopos* of the source and target text

It seems indisputable that both the source text and target text have the same *skopos*: to entertain the child reader and to help him learn letters of the alphabet. The composition is also part of the *skopos*; the translation must meet the requirements set by the alphabets and illustrations. Unlike Oittinen (2000: 12), I do not think that the *skopos* always changes in translation because the audience is different. I believe that the translation strategy is chosen according to the new audience, but this does not automatically indicate a change of *skopos*. Therefore, in my view, *skopos* and audience are two separate — although interdependent — variables and it is meaningful to distinguish them from one another.

5.2 Localization of the letters of alphabet

On notable difference between the original text and the Finnish version is the order of the alphabets. Whereas the alphabets are in the Latin alphabetical order (A, B, C, D...Z) in the source text, the target text has not followed the established convention. The alphabets in the translation are mostly in a random order, although some alphabets are placed on the same pages as the source text's alphabets. It is also necessary to note that the Finnish translation includes umlauts Ä, Ö and Å, which are distinctive to the Finnish language, but which do not appear in English. Since it was

not possible to create completely new illustrations for these letters of the alphabet, the problem has been solved by replacing certain letters of the original with the umlauts. In addition, the English language contains letters of the alphabet that are rare in the Finnish language. These include B, C, F, Q and W, for example, and they have been assigned to one single spread in the target text. These letters in Finnish are normally used only in foreign proper nouns or loanwords and, thus, it would be very difficult for the translator to keep each of them in the target text on their own spreads. It is hard to come up with several words containing these letters, not to mention the fact that the illustrations also restrict the possible translation choices. To solve this problem, the translator has placed the rare letters of the alphabet in a single spread at the end of the book and written only a few examples of each letter. Interestingly, letter G is completely missing from the target text, although it is a rare letter in Finnish and very similar to the above-mentioned B, C, F, Q and W. It would seem strange to have G left out purposely, because all the other rare letters of the alphabet are in the target text. I believe it is a question of an unintentional mistake. Below is a table of the source text letters and their equivalents in the target text:

Source text letter	Target text letter	Page numbers (target text)
A	A	6—9
B	I	10—11
C	I	12—13
CH	J	14—15
D	E	16—17
E	P	18—19
F	E	20—21
G	T	22—23
H	K	24—25
I	Y	26—27
J	H	28—29
K	K	30—31
L	L	32—33
M	M	34—35
N	N	36—37

O	O	38—39
P	P	40—41
Q	Ö	42—43
R	R	44—45
S	S	46—47
SH	D	48—49
T	T	50—51
TH	NK, NG	52—53
U	U	54—55
V	V	56—57
W	Ä	58—59
X, Z, Y	B, C, F, Q, W, X, Z, Å	60—61

Table 1: order of the letters in the source and target text

It is also worth noting that the *Richard Scarry's ABC Word Book* contains consonant phonemes CH, SH, TH, which do not exist in Finnish. The translator has solved this problem by replacing them with letters J and D and consonant phoneme NK/ NG. This type of localization brings the text closer to the target audience by addressing familiar letters and phonemes more extensively. However, the localization of the letters of the alphabet meant that the ordering of the Latin alphabet, which is also conventional in Finland, was changed. This could create confusion if the target text reader expects the letters of the alphabet to occur in this conventional order. Both the source and target text have one letter of the alphabet (A) that occurs twice in the text at the very beginning. However, the Finnish text also has five other letters that occur twice: I, E, K, P and T (see table 1).

Since the picture book is an alphabet book, the differences between English and Finnish and their respective alphabet systems become highlighted, causing a translation problem. In order to fulfil the *skopos* for the target language readers, the translator must adapt, or localize, the alphabets of the source culture to those of the target culture. This requires introducing umlauts Ä, Ö and Å, changing the order of the letters, using some letters more than once and reducing the usage of letters rare in Finnish. This represents the information offered by the translator to the target text

readers, as translation is an offer of information about a source text offer of information. This offer of information is influenced by the expectations she has about the recipients and their situations. It is inevitable that the translator offers information in a different way than the producer of the original, because she has distinct expectations about her text's recipients, who belong to a different culture and language community. Thus, the information offer of the translation should be relevant and appropriate for the target text reader. In this case, umlauts Ä, Ö and Å are relevant to Finnish children but not to English speaking children, and therefore, the translator has offered this information in the target text. Similarly, the producer of the source text considered phonemes SH, CH and TH to be relevant to English speaking readers, whereas the translator expected them to be irrelevant to Finnish children. Consequently, the translator has regarded the information offer relating to the letters B, C, F, Q and W to be less relevant to the target text readers, since they are not used as frequently in Finnish as in English. Therefore, she decided to reduce the usage of these rare letters in the translation.

Had the translator kept the original ordering of the alphabets in the translation, she would have encountered great difficulties in the translation process. For example, in the case of the source text spread B (target text p. 10—11), which depicts a scene of boats in a harbor. It would be impossible to find 20—40 words containing b's for this spread, and even if the translator were able to come up with enough words, a great deal of them would be loan words and foreign proper nouns. This, in turn, would make the text more difficult to read and comprehend, especially for a child. As Oittinen (2004: 27) mentioned earlier (see subchapter 3.1), typically picture books contain simple language that resembles speech. The language in the source text is simple, and this would change in the translation if foreign, difficult loan words were introduced. It is also important that the child is able to understand the text he is given; otherwise he might lose interest in the book and the *skopos* would not be achieved. Similarly in Klingberg's (1986: 11—12) terms, the degree of adaptation would become less than that of the original. Also the reading-aloud situation might become less appealing if the parent is not accustomed to pronouncing strange loan words. All these aspects would jeopardize the achievement of the *skopos*.

5.3 Letters and illustrations — double trouble

It is obvious that the letters of alphabet narrow down the possible translation choices considerably. For example, if a source text spread has letter **D** and a text ‘bulldozer’, the translator can use an exact literal equivalent only if it contains the letter chosen for this spread in the target text. *Bulldozer* in Finnish would be *puskutraktori*. Therefore, when the letter of the alphabet in the target text is **E**, as in this case, the translator cannot use this equivalent as such in the text, since it does not contain the letter **E**. It is also very important to remember that the illustration has a restrictive function. In the above-mentioned example, the translator cannot translate the ‘bulldozer’ as ‘etana’ (snail), since there is no snail in the picture. Thus, not only must the translator take into account the chosen letter of the alphabet, but also the illustration.

There are several ways for the translator to solve this problem. She can omit the word completely and not translate it at all, or *substitute* it with another word or phrase that contains the letter of the alphabet and that is compatible with the picture. For example, in the case of the bulldozer picture, the translator has substituted the ‘bulldozer’ with the word ‘telaketjut’ (‘continuous track’). This way the translator has been able to use the letter **E** in the word, and the translation is not incompatible with the picture, since the bulldozer has continuous tracks. Below are few similar cases, where translation refers to the same picture with a different word:

Picture	Source text	Target text	Translation of target text
A river flowing underneath a bridge.	V tiver	V (p. 56) vettä	water
A multi-story house with a chimney on top of the roof.	U house	U (p. 54) savupiippu	chimney
A pig riding a scooter.	S scooter	S (p. 46) saparo	pigtail
Huckle stumbles on a blue carpet with fringe.	P carpet	P (p. 41) hapsut	fringe

Table 2: examples of substitution

Using dialogue is a frequent strategy of the translator as well. It is possible to solve the problem caused by the letter of the alphabet and picture by making the characters say different things. Below are some great examples of this kind of strategy:

Picture	Source text	Target text	Translation of target text
A giraffe holding an apple up in a treetop.	F giraffe	E (p. 20) Herkullinen omena!	Delicious apple!
A farmer standing next to a glass greenhouse and garden plot.	G a gardener by a glass greenhouse	T (p. 23) Tulkaa ostamaan tuoretta salaattia.	Come buy fresh salad.
A mouse peeking through the doorway.	K a mouse peeking through a crack	K (p. 31) Onko ketään kotona?	Is anybody home?
A driver driving a cement mixer.	M cement mixer	M (p. 34) Minä valmistan sementtiä.	I'm making cement.
Owl tossing a rope to the captain of a sinking ship.	O owl tossing a rope.	O (p. 39) Ota koppi.	Catch.
A zebra wearing clothes.	Z a zebra in a zipper jacket	F (p. 61) Terveisiä Afrikasta!	Hello from Africa!

Table 3: examples of dialogue in the target text

Another way, in which the translator has solved the problem of incompatibility between the translation equivalent and the letter of the alphabet, is the usage of a *specification* that contains the chosen letter and the translation equivalent. Naturally, it has to be compatible with the illustration too. For example, on target text page 21 there is a flag flapping on the pole. The Finnish letter chosen for this spread is E. The source text uses letter F and describes the picture with the noun 'flag'. The target text describes the scene as 'lippu liehuu' ('flag flapping'). Since the equivalent (lippu) does not contain the chosen letter of the alphabet (E), the translator has added a predicate (liehuu) to solve this problem. Below are more examples of this type of translation solution:

Picture	Source text	Target text	Translation of target text
a kite is in the sky with its string tangled in the sails of a windmill.	I kite	Y (p. 27) Leija pysyy hyvin ylhäällä.	The kite stays up well.
a yellow jug/ bottle	J jug	H (p. 28) mehukannu	juice jug
a yellow key in the king's pocket	K key	K (p. 30) kulta-avain	gold key
doctor's instruments and medicine bottles flying from his car	M medicine	M (p. 34) vitamiinilääkettä	vitamin medicine
a sandwich with carrot, watermelon, salad and cheese	S sandwich	S (p. 47) vihannesleipä	vegetable sandwich
Lowly Worm wearing a cap, a scarf and a shoe	SH shoe	D (p. 48) Madon kenkä	Lowly's shoe
a kite, whose string is tangled in a treetop.	T kite	T (p. 50) Takertunut leija	tangled kite
a lorry unloading a load of nuts on the street	U nuts	U (p. 55) suolapähkinöitä	salted nuts
a glove falling from a passing airplane	V glove	V (p. 56) varahansikas	spare glove

Table 4: examples of specification in the target text

All of the translation solutions above are compatible with both the chosen letters of the alphabet as well as the pictures. In the first (I—Y), third (K—K), fifth (S—S), sixth (SH—D) and seventh (T—T) examples, the translator has clearly used the pictures as clues when creating the target text. For instance, the color of the key (yellow) and contents of the sandwich have stimulated the translator's imagination. The examples two (J—H), four (M—M), eight (U—U) and nine (V—V) can also be deemed compatible with the pictures. The jug could be a juice jug and the doctor's medicine bottle could contain vitamin medicine. Similarly, there is no way to identify from the pictures that the nuts are not salted nuts or the glove falling from the plane is not a spare glove.

Omission and *addition* are also frequently used strategies in the translation. If the translator is unable to come up with any translation solution for a certain word and picture, she might omit it. Often, though, she has added a new word or phrase in some other part of the spread to compensate for this “loss”. For instance, on source text spread CH and target text spread J (p. 14—15), there is a picture of a butcher’s shop. The source text refers to the latch on the shop’s door as ‘**latch**’ (‘salpa’). The target text has no text relating to the door or latch. Instead, the translator has added two words to another picture on the spread. There is a goat pulling a sled with a log attached to it by chains. The translator has added the words ‘**ketjut**’ (‘chains’) and ‘**jalakset**’ (‘skids’) to this picture, whereas the source text has no text relating to the goat or the sled. Also on target text spread O (p. 39—40) there are words, such as ‘**auto**’ (‘car’), ‘**laatikko**’ (‘box’) and ‘**katto**’ (‘roof’) added next to the pictures of a blue car driving on the road, a box falling from a ship and a yellow roof of a hotel. The source text does not have any text relating to these details, but it has a few words that are not included in the target text: ‘**rose**’, ‘**wagon**’ and ‘**portholes**’. However, it is not possible to say which addition “replaces” which omission in the translation. Similarly, there might be cases in the target text where no additions are made to replace omissions.

There are many instances, however, where a literal, “*faithful*” translation is possible. In these cases, the translation equivalent fulfils both of the requirements set for the translation: the requirement of containing the given letter of the alphabet and the requirement of being compatible with the picture. It seems that if the Finnish equivalent of the source text word contains the chosen letter, it is used in the translation as such. Below are some clear examples of this strategy:

Source text	Target text (p.12—13)	Translation of target text
C cup	I kuppi	cup
C coffeepot	I kahvipannu	coffeepot
C accordion	I haitari	accordion
C candle	I kynttilä	candle

Source text	Target text (p. 18—19)	Translation of target text
E helmet	P kypärä	helmet
E beetle	P koppakuoriainen	beetle (bug)
E pole	P pylväs	pole
Source text	Target text (p.30—31)	Translation of target text
K king	K kuningas	king
K sock	K sukka	sock
K pocket	K tasku	pocket
K fork	K haarukka	fork
K cook book	K keittokirja	cook book
K stick	K keppi	stick
K back door	K takaovi	back door
K keyhole	K avaimenreikä	keyhole
K pumpkin	K kurpitsa	pumpkin
Source text	Target text p. 38—39)	Translation of target text
O boy	O poika	boy
O motorboat	O moottorivene	motorboat
O horn	O torvi	horn
O rowing-boat	O soutuvene	rowing-boat
O bottle	O pullo	bottle
O top	O korkki	top
O bottom	O pohja	bottom

O oar	O airo	oar
O buoy	O poiju	buoy
O bow	O kokka	bow (on a boat)
O clock	O kello	clock
O tower	O torni	tower
O bow	O jousi	bow
O arrow	O nuoli	arrow
O Lowly Worm	O Mato Matala	Lowly Worm
O trolley bus	O johdinauto	trolley bus

Table 5: examples of literal translation equivalents

There are only few instances, where the translator could have opted for an exact equivalent, but chose to use the same strategy as in table 4. Below are the two instances I found in the text:

Source text	Target text	Translation of target text
R raccoon	R (p. 45) Pesukarhu särpii sitruunamehua.	Raccoon slurps lemon juice.
T tyres	T (p. 51) autonrenkaat	car tyres

Table 6: examples where literal translation could have been used in the target text

In the first case, the translator could have merely translated the ‘raccoon’ as ‘pesukarhu’, since it fulfils the requirements set by the letter (R) and picture. Similarly, the second example could have been translated ”faithfully” as ‘renkaat’ (‘tyres’) without the use of premodifier ‘auton’ (‘car’). The reason(s) why the translator has used this type of translation solution could be that this way she was

able to incorporate three R's instead of one and two T's instead of one. However, it is impossible to know the motives behind individual translation solutions.

The longer sections of text may also prove challenging, since they contain several words that have the given letter of the alphabet. For instance, on target text pages 18—19 there is an illustration depicting firemen arriving to a bunnies' house. There is smoke coming from the house and two bunnies are at the window and balcony. The translator has chosen the letter P to this spread, whereas the original work uses E. Below are the passages from source and target texts, and a back-translation of the target text:

Example 1

Ernie Elephant and his **excellent** firemen have just driven up to **extinguish** an **enormous** fire. **Mother** Rabbit is screaming for **help**. Do not **fear**! They will **save** her! (source text)

Pappa Puputti **paistoi perunoita** ja **poltti** ne. **Pupurouva** **pelästyi** ja **kipitti rappuja** **pitkin parvekkeelle**. Sitten hän hälytti **palokunnan**. (target text, p.18)

Father Bunny fried potatoes and burned them. Mrs. Bunny got scared and scampered the stairs to the balcony. Then she called the fire department. (back-translation of target text)

Similarly, on target text page 54 there is a picture of a street flooded by rainwater. A raccoon is standing on top of his car that has sunk in the muddy water. The letters for both source and target text is U. Below are the extracts from the two texts followed by a back-translation of the target text:

Example 2:

When rain **pours** down, the **ground turns** to **mud**. **Uncle Louie's** car has **sunk** **under** the **surface**. **Tough luck**, **Louie**! (source text)

Olen jo **useita tunteja huutanut** **turhaan apua**. **Luulen** ettei **auta muu kuin uida**, **tuumi Uuno**-setä. (target text p. 54).

For several hours, I have called for help in vain. I think there is no other option than to swim, thought uncle Uuno. (back-translation of target text)

On target text pages 42—43 there are pigs, ducks, mice, a Queen and her friends playing croquet. The pigs, mice and ducks are arguing with each other. The source text uses the letter Q for this spread, but the target text has letter Ö.

Example 3:

The **Q**ueen is playing cro**q**u**et** with her friends. They seem to be **q**uarreling. Please! Let's be **q**uiet! (source text)

Työpäivän jälkeen on hyödyllistä harrastaa liikuntaa. Sen sijaan on täysin hyödytöntä rähinöidä pelissä. (target text p. 42).

After work, it's useful to do exercise. However, it's completely useless to quarrel during the game. (back-translation of target text)

On target text page 39 a boat crashes onto the harbor and it seems to be sinking. The Captain is trying to rescue himself from the wreck. Both the source text and target text have chosen the letter O for this spread.

Example 4:

Someone **f**orgot to **s**top. The **b**oat is **g**oing **d**own to the **b**ottom of the **h**arbour. (source text)

Osmo ei **o**sannut **o**hjata kunnolla. **V**oikohan **u**ponneen laivan **n**ostaa **p**ohjasta? (target text p. 39).

Osmo couldn't steer properly. Can the sunken ship be lifted up from the bottom? (back-translation of target text)

The examples show that the translations cannot be considered “faithful” or equivalent in the sense of sameness when compared with the source text. The letters of the alphabet and the pictures delimit the translator's options, but they also open other possibilities. The translator can use them as clues when writing the target text. For instance, example 2 indicates, that the house fire was started by burnt potatoes. The source text does not convey such information, so the target text is the result of the translator's reading experience and her interpretation of the pictures. After all, the illustrations are also information offers from the source text producer to the recipients. The translations indicate how the translator has interpreted the source text and the pictures, and created a target text information offer on the basis of this interpretation. This also supports Oittinen's (2000: 84) idea that as the translator interprets the text, it becomes a completely new text instead of a mere reproduction. From the examples we can also note how Reiss & Vermeer's (2013: 107) rule (3) holds true in this case: a back-translation does not reproduce the source text offer of information.

5.4 Narrator—Narratee interaction

As mentioned earlier, Scarry was advocate in promoting a new kind of reading experience, where there would be time to stop and comment the illustrations or events in the pages. He did not want the parent to rush through the text, but give the child an opportunity to participate as well. In *Richard Scarry's ABC Word Book*, he executed this aspect by including questions for the reader(s) in the text:

Source text	Illustration
D Where is Huckle hiding?	Bulldozer driver is driving dangerously, knocking down everything that gets in his way. Huckle is hiding inside the excavator.
E Look at the three firemen on a leaning ladder. Are they going to topple over?	Smoke is coming from a house and the firemen have been called in to extinguish the fire. The firemen are climbing up a shaky ladder with a hose.
F Farmer Fox grows food in his fields for his family. There are five furry foxes hiding in the farmhouse. Can you find them?	Farmer Fox is driving his tractor in a field. There are five foxes peeking through the windows of the house.
K The king is having a snack, He is licking a gherkin. Kangaroo is skating in with a cake she has baked for the king. Would you like to share his snack?	King and guests are sitting at the table eating and drinking. A cook is preparing food in front of a stove. A kangaroo is serving cake to the table.

Table 7: examples of reader interaction in the source text

These questions engage the child's attention during the reading process, and thus indicate a desire to pay special attention to the reading situation. Especially the first (D) and the third (F) example also indicate what Lewis (2001: 66) noted (see subchapter 3.1) about picture books: they can employ game-like features. In this case, the child is expected to find and point out where Huckle and the five foxes are hiding. Thus, it mimics a game of hide-and-seek.

Similarly, the translator has kept this interactive, playful feature in the target text, but not always on the same instances as the original. Below are examples of reader interaction carried out in the translation:

Target text	Translation of target text	Illustration
E (p. 16) Heikki ei näe ojaa. Mitenkähän nyt käy?	Heikki can't see the ditch. What will happen now?	Heikki is driving carelessly in his bulldozer and heading straight towards a ditch.
E (p. 20) Kettulan isäntä työskentelee pellolla. Pienet ketut piileskelevät yläkerrassa. Keksi niille nimet. Minne kapteeni Merikarhu on mennyt?	Farmer Fox is working in the field. The little foxes are hiding upstairs. Come up with names for them. Where has Captain Salty gone?	Farmer Fox is driving his tractor in a field. There are five foxes peeking through the windows of the house. Captain's hat floating in the river.
K (p. 24) Keksitkö kuka on kätkenyt tikapuut?	Can you guess who hid the ladder?	Huckle is blowing a horn and he has a very high top hat on his head.
K uka on kätkössä lakanakasassa?	Who is hiding in a heap of sheets?	Two small bunnies under white cloths.
P (p. 40) Paksu Paula pitää kutsut. Itse hän pimputtaa pianoa. Kuka on piilossa pianon takana?	Chubby Paula is having a party. She herself is playing the piano. Who's hiding behind the piano?	Rudolf is hiding behind Paula's piano.

Table 8: examples of reader interaction in the target text

Undoubtedly, the interactive features have been deemed as important to preserve in the translation as well. One of the statements of *skopos* theory was that the translation informs the target recipients about the source text offer of information. The translator's information simulates the original information offer, but not in a biuniquely reversible way: the playful and interactive elements occur in different instances than in the original, or they are slightly distinct in their content. The interactive elements also help to achieve the *skopos*, since they entertain the child

and keep his attention on the book. Thus, in this case, the interactive features are regarded as essential for the achievement of the *skopos*.

5.5 Character names and domestication

The names of characters have been domesticated in the Finnish translation. For example, ‘Huckle’ is ‘Hessu’, ‘Lowly Worm’ became ‘Mato Matala’, ‘Sergeant Murphy’ is translated as ‘Konstaapeli Hallikainen’ and the aviator ‘Rudolf’ is named ‘Harri Hurri’. These names have been used in other Finnish Scarry translations as well, and thus they have become quite established names for these characters. The characters ‘Mr.’ and ‘Mrs. Pig’ were translated as ‘Possulan isä’ and ‘äiti’. ‘Dr. Monday’s’ name in the Finnish version is ‘Tohtori Koiranen’, ‘Captain Salty’ is ‘Kapteeni Merikarhu’ and ‘Mother Cat’ is ‘Kissalan äiti’. I was not able to find out whether these are established names for the characters, similar to ‘Hessu’, ‘Mato Matala’ and ‘Konstaapeli Hallikainen’. A hippo called ‘Hilda’ is translated as ‘Matilda’ on target text pages 8 and 54, but on page 28 she is referred to as ‘Hilja’. Possibly Hilja was chosen for this spread since it uses letter H, but it seems strange to change the character’s name in the middle of the book. It creates confusion when the illustration depicts the same hippo, but the translation refers to her with two different names.

The domestication of source text proper names could indicate that the translator wanted to bring the target text closer to the culture of its intended audience — Finnish children. Children are not expected to possess extensive knowledge of other cultures and their tolerance towards strange words or cultures is considered to be lower than that of adults. When knowledge of foreign cultures grows, however, the attitude towards unfamiliar cultural elements becomes more approving. According to Oittinen (Paloposki & Oittinen 2008: 384), this shift took place in Finland during the 1980’s and 1990’s, when the Anglo-Saxon influence became more widespread. This trend is also evident in translations. For example, the name of the protagonist in *Alice in Wonderland* was allowed to keep her British name ‘Alice’ in the Finnish translation from 1995, whereas the 1972 and 1906 translations domesticated her as ‘Liisa’. (Paloposki & Oittinen 2008: 384.) Nowadays, names are more often left untranslated, but this is also dependent on the genre: domestication still occurs in fantasy-, scifi and small children’s books. In the latter case, especially the readability

of the text affects to the decision to adapt or not to adapt character names. (Oittinen 2004: 97.)

It should also be remembered, however, that some of the characters have established translation equivalents in Finnish which have been used in other Scarry translations as well. The reader might be confused if the translation did not contain the familiar names. Additionally, if the translator used the familiar names and left the rest of the names untranslated, this would be inconsistent. As Oittinen (2000: 81) noted, translation is never merely the translation of texts, but whole text situations. The way the names have been translated in other Scarry translations affects the whole situation. Intertextuality is also important in this case, since the translation of character names refers to the same characters in earlier Scarry translations and thus, they refer to whole earlier Scarry translations.

Similarly, the texts included in the pictures have been translated into Finnish. Many vehicles, signs and buildings have texts, such as ‘Greasy George’s Garage’, ‘O.K. Hotel’, ‘Bakery’ and ‘Parking’. All of these texts are handwritten and included in the illustrations. Although usually it is not possible to change the illustrations in the translation, in this case the source texts have been replaced with similar handwritten Finnish translations. Below are some examples of the text-in-pictures:

Source text	Target text
A A green repair van with text REPAIRS	A (p. 6) KORJAUSAUTO
A A yellow sign warning of a manhole: DANGER	A (p. 7) VAARA
B A red brick building with signboard BARBER	I (p. 11) PARTURI
D A brick building with signboard CHEMIST	E (p. 16) APTEEKKI
G sign: BARGAIN SALE	T (p. 23) TÄSTÄ HALVALLA
I Sign by a river: NO SWIMMING	Y (p. 27) KYLPESMINEN KIELLETTY

M Plumber's car: PLUMBER	M (p. 35) MIKKO PUMPPU
------------------------------------	----------------------------------

Table 9: examples of text-in-pictures in the source and target text

Some translations are literal (i.e. DANGER, VAARA; BARBER, PARTURI), some are adapted more freely. It could be that the translation is adapted if the literal translation would not include the chosen letter of the alphabet. However, in some cases a literal translation would include the letter, such as in the case of PLUMBER, MIKKO PUMPPU. The literal translation would be PUTKIMIES, which also includes the letter M. It is not possible to say for certain, why the translator chose another equivalent for the target text. This type of translation solution could indicate adaptation for child readers. On the other hand, it might be an allusion to the card game “Hullunkuriset perheet”, a Finnish version of the English Old Maid card game. However, as already noted, the true motives of the translator will remain a mystery.

Instances of cultural context adaptation and localization can also be observed in the target material. For instance, on pages 14—15 there is a picture of a snowy village with characters engaging in different activities. This spread has the consonant phoneme CH in the source text, but in the target text it has the letter J. On page 15 there is a group of what appears to be children in winter clothes with their mouths open, and one of them is holding a book. The source text describes the picture as ‘children caroling’. In the target text, the picture is accompanied by the opening lyrics of a popular Finnish Christmas carol *Sylvian joululaulu* (‘Ja niin joulu joutui jo taas pohjolaan...’)

Another example of adaptation can be found on pages 50—51, where there is a picture of train crashing into a truck full of tomatoes. The letter in both source and target text is T. In the source text, the train has text *TOOT R. R.* in its middle part. In the target text, this has been replaced with *VALTION RAUTATIIET*. The name *Valtion rautatiet* (State Railways), shortened as *VR*, was the official name of the Finnish rail transport service during 1862–1995. Nowadays the state-owned company is known as VR Yhtymä Oy (VR Group), but the short name VR still remains in use.

The sign on target text page 36 has the word *ANNANKATU* written in it. The source text's sign says *HIGH STREET*. Both texts have the letter N on this spread. High

street in English can refer to an existing, real street, or it could be used as a metonym to indicate a street with lots of commercial activity (main shopping or business street). In the illustration, however, there are no shops or stores pictured: only a news stand, airplanes in the sky and two cars and several pedestrians. Therefore, the reference to a business street is not at least evident. There is no equivalent to High Street in Finnish. The translation, *Annankatu*, is a real street located in central Helsinki, Finland. It does not have, at least to my knowledge, a similar meaning as the High Street concept. The possible reason for choosing *Annankatu* could be that it contains three N's, which go well with the chosen letter of the alphabet. Similarly, the references to *Annankatu* and *VR* could also be targeted at the reading parent, who is more likely to recognize these familiar names.

On the same spread, page 37, there is a boy in front of a news stand reaching out with his left hand towards the seller. The seller is holding a small, orange bag in her hand. The target text reads: '*Saanko Aku Ankan*'. ('Can I have a Donald Duck'). The source text does not have any text for this picture. *Aku Ankka* (Donald Duck) is a popular weekly comic focusing on the adventures of Walt Disney's Donald Duck and his friends. In the picture, the seller seems to be holding a small bag — possibly sweets — instead of a comic, and therefore the translation seems a bit inconsistent with the picture. However, since it is a question of a news stand, the child could be buying comics as well.

On target text pages 48—49 there is a picture of a laundry room, where Mother Bear is washing clothes in a sink and children are playing by the clothesline and behind a sheet. A sheep carrying lots of brushes arrives through the door. The source text phoneme is SH and the target text uses letter D. Below are extracts from the source text and target text and a back-translation of the target text:

Example 5:

A **sheep** in **shabby** clothes crashed through the door to **show** what his **brushes** could do. One could even turn on the **shower**! Mother told him to **shut** the door. The cold air was making her **shiver**. (source text)

Harjaedustaja syöksyi äidin luo. Teidänkin on todella aika uudistaa harjanne. Nyt myydään harjoja todella edullisesti. Yhden harjan saa viidellä markalla. Kahden harjan hinta on vain yhdeksän markkaa. (target text p. 49)

The brush representative barged in to mother's. It is really the time you too renew your brushes. Now the brushes are sold really cheaply. You get one brush for five markkas. The price of two brushes is only nine markkas. (back-translation of target text)

The localization in this text concerns the use of the former currency of Finland (markka). The Finnish markka was Finland's official currency from 1860 to 2002. Markka was replaced by euro after Finland joined the EU and its monetary union. Although this 5th edition is from 2008, the former currency has been kept in the text. Small children, who were born after 2002 might not understand what markka is since they are only used to euro.

If considered from Klingberg's (1986) point of view, the above-mentioned examples would indicate unnecessary cultural context adaptation, since the degree of adaptation is now greater in the translation when compared with the original. The source text examples do not really include any culture-specific elements (except for the High Street example), but in the translations the target text is brought closer to the cultural sphere of the reader through localization. However, if our starting point in translation is the function (*skopos*) of the translation, adaptation or localization are not to be considered avoidable *per se*, but their relevance as translation strategies should be assessed only in relation to the chosen *skopos*. Considering the *skopos* of this text is to help small, Finnish children learn the alphabets and learn to read, I would not consider domestication or localization as incompatible with this purpose. In fact, they seem completely justifiable from the *skopos* point of view.

6 Conclusions

In this chapter, I shall draw concluding remarks about the case study in the light of the analysis and the theoretical framework explained above. If we turn back to the general rules of Reiss and Vermeer's (2013: 107) translational action (see chapter 4) by applying them to this analysis, we can see how they can be employed in the translation of alphabet books.

Rule (1) is fulfilled in this case as the *translatum*'s *skopos* is to help children learn the letters of the alphabet by incorporating a given letter in the text, which also relates to the pictures. It is the guiding principle in the translation process, which affects the possible translation choices — as we have seen from the numerous examples shown in this thesis. Similarly, the simple language and interactive, entertaining features of the translation also indicates a desire to achieve the *skopos*. Rule (2) is evident in the localization of the letters of the alphabet as well as in the way the translator adapts the text to meet the demands set by the letters and pictures. The preservation of the elements crucial to the narrator—narratee relationship also represents the information offer chosen by the translator to be incorporated in her text. Rule (3) can be detected in many of the examples given in this thesis: a back-translation would not lead to the exactly same information offer given by the source text. The translator as recipient of the original text and illustrations makes her own interpretation of them and chooses those items she considers adequate for the achievement of the *skopos*. She creates her target text shaped by this interpretation and the *skopos*. Rule (4) can also be considered fulfilled in this translation; it is understandable and coherent for a Finnish reader. The usage of simple language instead of strange, foreign loan words creates a comprehensible target text. Furthermore, the translation is not in conflict with the pictures or the letters of the alphabet, thus the translator follows the *skopos* consistently throughout the target text. Finally, rule (5) is also fulfilled since there is a connection between the source and target text because of the illustrations. Intertextual coherence is also evident in the parts where “faithful” translation was used (see table 5). Lastly, rule (6) seems to be true in this case; the intertextual coherence is subordinate to the *skopos* and to the intratextual coherence. The target text cannot be regarded as a literal translation of the source text, since the *skopos* requires significant adaptation for the reader, and

also the target reader should understand the text he is given. Thus, it seems to substantiate the hypothesis I proposed in the Introduction.

When considering the translation in the light of the theories formulated in the field of children's literature, the target text seems to support many remarks. The readability has been borne in mind throughout the process, since the target text includes easy, understandable and readable language. The longer sections of text consist primarily of short main clauses, and the language is rather simple. The translation also seems to substantiate Oittinen's (2004: 114, 124—125) remarks (see subchapter 3.1) about the restrictive and inspiring function of the pictures. It is evident that the illustrations act both as restrictive elements and inspirational clues for the translator. Similarly the domestication of character names seems to support Oittinen's (2004: 97) observations (see chapter 5) that names are often domesticated in books for young children. This is also influenced by the readability of the text and the fact that domestication of names was a normal convention during the publication of the first edition of the translation (1974).

The analysis also reveals interesting results concerning the localization of individual text pieces. In Klingberg's (1986) view, this represents unnecessary cultural context adaptation, since the source text should be manipulated as little as possible. Oittinen (2000), however, does not oppose domestication, since in her view it is a natural part of every translation process. She regards the whole text situation as the most important aspect in translation — the situation of the translation, her child image and the reader. In addition, as the *skopos* is to entertain the child reader and help him learn the letters of the alphabet, adaptation or domestication is not in conflict with this aim.

Similarly, I do not agree with Shavit's (1986) notion that adaptation as such is a sign of disrespect towards children's literature. Contrary, I consider the regard to the target audience — and thus to the *skopos* — as a sign of respect towards both the author and the whole sphere of children's literature. If translators are not allowed to make justifiable decisions regarding the translated text, they will never receive the credit they deserve. As long as we consider reproduction as the translator's only acceptable contribution, the true, complex nature of translating will never be understood. On the other hand, I partly understand Shavit's worry over manipulation

of children's literature, but only when it is carried out *without* regard to the child reader — or to the *skopos*, since children's literature can be adapted to adults as well.

Like O'Sullivan (2005: 12) and Oittinen (2000: 69) point out (see chapter 3), children's literature is always created by adults — children usually have no say in what is made for them. Therefore, as adults are responsible for the production of children's literature, they (writers, translators, parents) should have high regard for children and their literature, since children cannot question the decisions adults make. Adults must not be, as O'Connell (2006[1999]: 17) states, "out of touch" with the world of children, but like Oittinen says (2006[1995]: 84—89), engage in a dialogue with children, the author and child image, and explore the carnivalistic culture of children.

In this thesis, I also aimed to show how the translation of an ABC book offers unique challenges for the translator. This becomes very clear from the different alphabet systems of English and Finnish. In addition to the general problems of translating picture books, the translator is faced with a challenging task to render the text to a comprehensible whole for a reader, whose cultural context and language differs from that of the source text reader. Due to the restrictive function of the letters and pictures, the translator must look in another direction and read the whole text situation, interpret the details of the pictures and the relationship between illustrations and verbal text. Many of the examples analyzed above show how the translator had to turn away from the words of the original and create a translation shaped by her interpretation. This, in my view, does not support the conception that translation of picture books is merely easy and fun activity with no real effort involved. Translating picture books and ABC books is a challenging task involving creativity, verbal and visual literacy, interest towards children's culture and regard to the intended dual audience of both parents and their offspring.

The *skopos* theory's one aim was to move the focus away from the source text and pay attention to the target text and its intended readers. It could be interesting to continue studying different translations of this book. Finnish and English belong to two completely different language families, which could be one of the reasons why the translation differs so much from the original. If we compared the *Richard Scarry's ABC Word Book* with Germanic language translations, would we get

different results? Additionally, further research could be made on the overall translation markets of alphabet books. Are they often translated to other languages or even regarded as “translatable”? A case study could be conducted in Finland, for instance. Are alphabet books often translated into Finnish, or are our ABC books primarily of domestic production? In the Introduction, I pointed out how translations dominate the children’s literature market in Finland. It might be interesting to compare these figures with alphabet books; is this tendency evident as well, or are most of our ABC books of domestic origin?

Lastly, I would like to return to the discussion concerning the loyalty to the author and regard to the target readers. *Skopos* theory answers this question in a rather straightforward manner; intertextual coherence is the least important criteria in translation. The source text does not determine how the translation is to be carried out, since the source text — as a product for a source culture situation — is aimed at the source culture readers. The target text, on the other hand, is composed for a target culture situation, and its adequacy is to be assessed only on this basis. (Vermeer 1989: 175.)

As Oittinen (2000: 84) notes (see chapter 3), we should not search loyalty from words or text, but from the entire story-telling situation brought to life for a new audience. The translation — when accepted, loved and given a new life in the target culture — achieves loyalty towards the original author (Oittinen 2000: 84). The book I have used in this thesis is the 5th edition (2008). Altogether, six editions have been published so far, and the 6th edition (2010) seems to be currently out of print, which indicates something about the book’s popularity. In addition, in Helsinki Metropolitan area libraries there are currently 162 copies of the translation available, of which 120 are being borrowed while I am writing this text (www.helmet.fi). This, in my view, is a strong indication that the translation lives on in the target audience.

List of sources

Primary sources

Scarry, Richard (2001[1971]): *Richard Scarry's ABC Word Book*. HarperCollins Publishers Ltd., London.

Scarry, Richard (2008[1974]): *ABC Kirja*. 5th edition, 2008. Translated by Mervi Miettinen. Tammi, Helsinki.

Secondary sources

Chaney, Jeanne H. (1993): Alphabet books: Resources for learning. In *The Reading Teacher*; Vol. 47, No. 2. October 1993. p. 96—104.

Heinimaa, Elisse (2001): Kuvakirjat lapsen ja aikuisen maailmassa. In Suojala, Marja — Karjalainen, Maija (eds.) *Avaa Lastenkirja! Johdatus lastenkirjallisuuden lajeihin ja käyttöön*. Helsinki, Lasten keskus. p. 142—163.

Hunt, Peter (1992): Introduction. In Hunt, Peter (ed.) *Literature for Children. Contemporary Criticism*. Routledge, London. p. 1—17.

Klingberg, Göte (1986): *Children's fiction in the hands of the translators*. Lund, Gleerup.

Lathey, Gillian (2006): The Translator Revealed. Didacticism, Cultural Mediation, and Visions of the Child Reader in Translators' Prefaces. In Jan Van Coillie — Walter P. Verschueren (eds.) *Children's Literature in Translation. Challenges and Strategies*. St. Jerome Publishing, Manchester. p. 1—18.

Launis, Mika (2001): Kuvituksentutkinus, taiteen funktio ja identiteetti. In Rättyä, Kaisu — Raussi, Raija (eds.) *Tutkiva katse kuvakirjaan*. Suomen nuorisokirjallisuuden instituutin julkaisuja 23. BTJ Kirjastopalvelu, Helsinki. p. 57—77.

Lewis, David (2001): *Reading contemporary picture books. Picturing text*. RoutledgeFalmer, London.

Munday, Jeremy (2008): *Introducing translation studies. Theories and applications*. 2nd edition. 1st edition published in 2001. Routledge, London.

Nikolajeva, Maria — Scott, Carole (2001): *How Picturebooks Work?* Garland Publishing, New York.

Nodelman, Perry (1988): *Words About Pictures. The Narrative Art of Children's Picture Books*. The University of Georgia Press, Athens.

Nord, Christiane (1997): *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained*. St. Jerome Publishing, Manchester.

O'Connel, Eithne (2006[1999]): Translating for Children. In Lathey, Gillian (ed.) *The Translation of Children's Literature. A Reader*. Topics in Translation: 31. Multilingual Matters Ltd, Clevedon. p. 15—24. First published in In G. Anderman and M. Rogers (eds) (1999) *Word, Text, Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. p. 208—216.

- Oittinen, Riitta (2000): *Translating for Children*. Garland Publishing, New York.
- Oittinen, Riitta (2001a): On Translating Picture Books. In *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*. Vol. 9, issue 2. p. 109—125.
- Oittinen, Riitta (2001b): Kääntäjä kääntää kuvia. In Rättyä, Kaisu — Raussi, Raija (eds.) *Tutkiva katse kuvakirjaan*. Suomen nuorisokirjallisuuden instituutin julkaisuja 23. BTJ Kirjastopalvelu, Helsinki. p. 133—152.
- Oittinen, Riitta (2001c): Verbaalisen ja visuaalisen dialogia. Ajatuksia kuvakirjan kääntämisestä. In Kukkonen, Pirjo — Hartama-Heinonen, Ritva (eds.) *Mission, Vision, Strategies and Values. A Celebration of Translator Training and Translation Studies in Kouvola*. Helsinki University Press, Helsinki. p. 161—170.
- Oittinen, Riitta (2004): *Kuvakirja kääntäjän kädessä*. Lasten keskus, Helsinki.
- Oittinen, Riitta (2006[1995]): The Verbal and The Visual: On the Carnivalism and Dialogics of Translating for Children. In Lathey, Gillian (ed.) *The Translation of Children's Literature. A Reader*. Topics in Translation: 31. Multilingual Matters Ltd., Clevedon. p. 84—97. First published in 1995 in *Compar(a)ison* 2, p. 49—65.
- O'Sullivan, Emer (2005): *Comparative Children's Literature*. Routledge, London.
- O'Sullivan, Emer (2006[1998]): Translating for Children. In Lathey, Gillian (ed.) *The Translation of Children's Literature. A Reader*. Topics in Translation: 31. Multilingual Matters Ltd., Clevedon. p. 15—24. Published in 1998 in *Signal* 90, p. 167—175. This piece was originally presented as a conference paper at the European Children's Literature symposium in Stadtschlaining, Austria, in May 1998. It was subsequently published as "Translating pictures: The interaction of pictures and words in the translation of picture books" in P. Cotton (ed.) *European Children's Literature II* (p. 109—120). Kingston University.
- O'Sullivan, Emer (2010): *Historical Dictionary of Children's Literature*. Scarecrow Press Inc., Lanham.
- O'Sullivan, Emer (2013): Children's literature and translation studies. In Millán, Carmen — Bartrina, Francesca (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*. Routledge, London. p. 451—464.
- Paloposki, Outi & Oittinen, Riitta (2000): The Domesticated Foreign: In Chesterman, Andrew — Gallardo San Salvador, Natividad — Gambier, Yves (eds) *Translation in Context. Selected Contributions from the EST Congress, Granada 1998*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia. p. 373—390.
- Puurtinen, Tiina (2000): Lastenkirjallisuuden kääntäminen: normit, luettavuus ja ideologia. In Paloposki, Outi — Makkonen-Craig, Henna (eds) *Käännöskirjallisuus ja sen kritiikki*. Ammattikielten ja kääntämisen opintokokonaisuus (AKO), Helsinki. p. 106—131.
- Puurtinen, Tiina (2006[1994]): Translating Children's Literature: Theoretical Approaches and Empirical Studies. In Lathey, Gillian (ed.) *The Translation of Children's Literature. A Reader*. Topics in Translation: 31. Multilingual Matters Ltd., Clevedon. p. 54—64. First published In C. Robyns (ed.) (1994)

Translation and the (Re) production of Culture (p. 273—283) Leuven: The CERA Chair for Translation, Communication and Cultures.

Pym, Anthony (2010): *Exploring translation theories*. Routledge, London and New York.

Reiss, Katharina & Vermeer, Hans J. (2013): *Towards a general theory of translational action. Skopos theory explained*. Translated from the German by Christiane Nord, 2013. St. Jerome Publishing, Manchester. First published in German as *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie* (1984). Tübingen, Niemeyer

Retan, Walter — Risom, Ole (1997): *The Busy, Busy World of Richard Scarry*. Harry N, Abrams, Inc., Publishers, New York.

Shavit, Zohar (1986): *Poetics of children's literature*. University of Georgia Press, Athens.

Stolt, Birgit (2006[1978]): How Emil Becomes Michel: On the Translation of Children's Books. In Lathey, Gillian (ed.) *The Translation of Children's Literature. A Reader*. Topics in Translation: 31. Multilingual Matters Ltd., Clevedon. p. 67—83. First Published in G. Klingberg (ed.) (1978) *Children's books in translation* (p. 130—146). Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.

Venuti, Lawrence (1995): *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. Routledge, London.

Vermeer, Hans J. (1989): Skopos and Commission in Translational Action. In Chesterman, Andrew (ed.) *Readings in Translation Theory*. Oy Finn Lectura Ab, Helsinki. p. 173—187.

Wall, Barbara (1991): *The Narrator's voice. The Dilemma of Children's Fiction*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

[www.helmet.fi \(http://haku.helmet.fi/iii/encore/record/C__Rb1498633\)](http://haku.helmet.fi/iii/encore/record/C__Rb1498633). Accessed March 3 2016.

www.lastenkirjainstituutti.fi/lisatieto-kirjakorista-2014/. Accessed December 30 2015.

www.randomhousekids.com/authors-illustrators/detail/520. Accessed February 20 2016.

LYHENNELMÄ

Helsingin yliopisto

Nykykielten laitos

Englannin kääntäminen

Maija Käcklund: Skopos-teoria ja kuvakirjojen kääntäminen. Tapaustutkimus

Richard Scarry's ABC Word Book -teoksesta ja sen suomennoksesta.

Pro gradu -tutkielma 56 s, suomenkielinen lyhennelmä 14 s

Huhtikuu 2016

7 Suomenkielinen lyhennelmä

Johdanto

Lastenkirjojen ja kuvakirjojen tutkimiseen on herätty viime vuosikymmeninä, mutta niiden tutkimuskenttä kaipaisi edelleen lisää julkaisuja (O'Sullivan 2013: 460; Lewis 2000: xii). Hyvin vähän — jos lainkaan — tutkimusta on tehty aakkoskirjojen kääntämisestä. Aakkoskirjat, tai ABC-kirjat, ovat lukemaan opetteleville lapsille suunnattuja kuvakirjoja, jotka usein nimeävät tavanomaisia asioita ja esineitä aakkosjärjestyksessä (O'Sullivan 2010: 16). Tämä tutkielma pyrkii havainnollistamaan englanninkielisen aakkoskirjan suomentamiseen liittyviä haasteita.

Materiaalina käytän Richard Scarryn *Richard Scarry's ABC Word Book* (2001[1971]) -teosta ja sen suomennosta *ABC kirja* (2008[1974], suom. Mervi Miettinen). Tutkielman teoriapohja nojautuu lasten- ja kuvakirjallisuuden tutkimuksiin, sekä näiden kääntämisestä esitettyihin näkemyksiin. Lisäksi tapaustutkimuksessa sovelletaan Reissin ja Vermeerin (2013) funktionaalista käännösteoriaa käsitteineen. Reissin ja Vermeerin skopos-teorian lähtökohtana on käännöksen haluttu tarkoitus (skopos), joka ohjaa käännösprosessia ja -strategiaa. Tutkielmassa on tarkoitus tarkastella, minkälaisiin ratkaisuihin skopoksen ja kuvakirjan erityispiirteiden huomioiminen on johtanut suomennoksessa.

Kirjailija ja tutkimusmateriaali

Richard Scarry (1919—1994) oli amerikkalainen lastenkirjailija ja kuvittaja, jonka tuotanto on erittäin tunnettua myös Yhdysvaltojen ulkopuolella. Scarryn kirjoille on ominaista runsas ja yksityiskohtainen kuvitus. Lisäksi hän halusi uudistaa

lukukokemuksen sisällyttämällä teoksiinsa kysymyksiä ja huomautuksia, jotka kiinnittäisivät huomion yksityiskohtiin ja loisivat dialogia lapsen ja vanhemman välille. (Retan & Risom 1997: 121, 126, 130.)

Tutkimusmateriaalina käytettävä *Richard Scarry's ABC Word Book* -teos on kuvitettu aakkoskirja, joka koostuu 28 aukeamasta. Jokaisen aukeaman yläkulmassa on aakkonen, jonka täytyy esiintyä aukeamalla olevissa sanoissa ja lauseissa. Nämä sanat ja lauseet esiintyvät kuvitusten yhteydessä ja liittyvät niihin kiinteästi. Teksti koostuu joko yksittäisistä sanoista, lausekkeista tai tekstikappaleista, jotka kuvaavat kuvissa näkyviä asioita, esineitä, tilanteita ja henkilöitä. Lähtötekstissä valittu aakkonen on väritetty punaisella värillä, mutta muut kirjaimet tekstissä ovat mustia. Aukeamien kuvitus käsittelee esimerkiksi liikennekaaosta, venesatamaa, juhlia tai jokapäiväistä elämää kylässä. Kuvitus on Scarrylle tyypillisesti melko runsasta ja yksityiskohtaista, ja niissä tapahtuu paljon eri asioita. Tekstiin on myös sisällytetty kysymyksiä ja tehtäviä lukijalle, mikä kuvastaa hyvin Scarryn pyrkimystä luoda dialogia lukijan ja lapsen välille.

Käytössäni oleva englanninkielinen painos on v. 2001 HarperCollins Publishers Ltd:n julkaisema. Luin myös Sterling Publishing -kustantamon julkaisemaa versiota kirjasta, ja tämä painos oli hieman suurempi kooltaan ja erilainen kuvitusten yksityiskohdiltaan. Sterlingin painoksesta puuttuivat muutamat kuvitukseen liittyvät yksityiskohdat. Kirjoissa oli myös muutamia yksittäisiä eroja sanatasolla, mutta suurin osa niistä koski brittienglannin ja amerikanenglannin eroja; esimerkiksi jalkakäytävää tarkoittava sana oli HarperCollinsin versiossa *pavement*, Sterlingin versiossa *sidewalk*. Valitsin HarperCollinsin painoksen, koska suomenkielisessä painoksessa mainitut kuvituksen yksityiskohdat on myös säilytetty. Käytössäni oleva suomenkielinen versio, *ABC kirja*, on Tammen vuonna 2008 julkaisema viides painos. Ensimmäinen suomenkielinen painos ilmestyi vuonna 1974, mutta vuonna 1981 teoksesta otettiin 2. uudistettu painos. Suomenkielisessä painoksessa kaikki teksti on mustaa, mutta valittu aakkonen on lihavoitu erottumaan muusta tekstistä. Fontti on hieman pienempi ja erilainen kuin lähtötekstissä. Lisäksi suomenkielinen versio sisältää sivunumerot, joita ei ole alkuteoksessa.

Lastenkirjallisuus ja kääntäminen

Lastenkirjallisuuden määrittelemineen on yhtä vaikeaa kuin lapsen tai lapsuuden määrittely (Oittinen 2000: 4). Yksinkertaisimmillaan voisi väittää, että kaikki kirjastojen ja kirjakauppojen lastenkirjahyllyillä olevat teokset ovat lastenkirjallisuutta (Oittinen 2004: 94). On kuitenkin syytä muistaa, että myös aikuisten suosimia kirjoja myydään lastenkirjallisuutena, ja monet lastenkirjat sisältävätkin omat tasonsa näille eri yleisöille (Oittinen 2000: 64). Lastenkirjallisuudelle tyypillistä on myös sen pedagoginen ulottuvuus: kirjan tulisi opettaa lapsille esimerkiksi moraalia ja hyvää käytöstä. Toisaalta, opettavuus voidaan toteuttaa myös tutustuttamalla lapsi uusiin kielellisiin ilmauksiin. Vaarana voi kuitenkin olla, että tämä tekee tekstistä liian vaikeasti ymmärrettävän ja luettavan. Lapsen sanavaraston kasvattaminen ja tarinan helppo ymmärrettävyys saattavat olla ristiriidassa keskenään. (Puurttinen 2000: 109.)

Lastenkirjallisuuden määrittelyä voisi lähestyä myös sen tuottajien tai lukijoiden näkökulmasta. Kirja voidaan luokitella lastenkirjaksi, jos kirjailija tai kirjailijat ovat sen niin määritelleet (Oittinen 2004: 94). Usein lastenkirjallisuuden määritelmä perustuukin aikuisten näkemyksiin ja heidän käsityksiinsä lapsista yhteiskunnassamme (Oittinen 2000: 64). Lastenkirjallisuuden perustana ovat tällöin lapsikäsitksemme, jotka muuttuvat ajan ja yhteiskunnan myötä. Ei ole mahdollista puhua mistään universaalista lapsuudesta tai lapsista homogeenisena ryhmänä (O’Sullivan 2005: 8). Kirjailijoilla, kääntäjillä ja kokonaisilla yhteiskunnilla on eriäviä käsityksiä lapsista ja lapsuudesta, ja nämä näkemykset heijastuvat myös kaikkeen lapsille tuotettuun kirjallisuuteen (Oittinen 2000: 4).

Venutin (1995) käsitteitä kotouttaminen (*domestication*) ja vieraannuttaminen (*foreignization*) on käytetty paljon lastenkirjallisuuden kääntämisen yhteydessä, sillä monet lastenkirjojen käännösongelmat koskevat alkutekstiin sisältyviä kulttuurispesifisiä piirteitä. Kotouttamisella tarkoitetaan sitä, että vieraita elementtejä häivytetään käännöksessä ja teksti tuodaan lähemmäs kohdelukijan omaa kulttuuria. Vieraannuttaminen sen sijaan tarkoittaa kulttuurispesifisten elementtien jättämistä käännökseen. Klingberg (1986) käyttää kotouttamisesta termiä adaptaatio. Hänen mukaansa kohdeyleisön oletetut kiinnostuksen kohteet, tietämyksen taso ja lukutaito vaikuttavat siihen, minkälaista kirjallisuutta lapsille luodaan. Adaptaatioksi nimitetään sitä, miten nämä eri piirteet huomioidaan ja tuodaan esiin valmiissa teoksissa.

(Klingberg 1986: 11.) Klingberg painottaa, että tämä adaptaation aste (*degree of adaptation*) on syytä säilyttää käännöksessä muuttumattomana. Lähtökulttuurille tutut elementit saattavat olla kohdekulttuurissa vieraita, jolloin kohdetekstin adaptaation aste voi olla alhaisempi kuin lähtötekstin, mikäli kääntäjä ei ota tätä seikkaa huomioon. Käännös saattaa tällöin muuttua liian vaikeaksi tai lukukokemus vähemmän kiinnostavaksi kohdeyleisön mielestä. Jotta adaptaation aste säilyisi samana, kääntäjä saattaa haluta muokata tekstiä vielä lisää. Klingberg puhuu kulttuurisen kontekstin adaptaatiosta (*cultural context adaptation*) silloin, kun lähtötekstin kulttuurispesifisiin elementteihin puututaan kohdetekstissä. (Klingberg 1986: 11—12.) Klingbergin (1986: 17) mielestä kulttuurisen kontekstin adaptaatiota tulisi käyttää vain silloin, kun se on aivan välttämätöntä, ja tällöinkin mielellään vain yksityiskohdissa. Hänen (1986: 17) mukaansa lähtötekstin tulisi olla etusijalla kohdetekstiin verrattuna, ja sitä tulisi manipuloida mahdollisimman vähän.

Toisenlainen näkökulma lastenkirjojen kääntämiseen kumpuaa lastenkirjallisuuden marginaalisesta arvostuksesta ja asemasta kirjallisuuden polysysteemissa. Perifeerisen aseman vuoksi kääntäjät voivat ottaa enemmän vapauksia lähtötekstin suhteen ja manipuloida sitä, sillä muut tekijät koetaan tärkeämmiksi kuin uskollisuus lähtötekstille (Puurtila 2006[1994]: 54). Shavit (1986) muodostaa näkemyksensä lastenkirjallisuuden kääntämisestä ja manipuloimisesta tämän marginaalisen aseman pohjalta. Shavitin mukaan tietyt käännösnormit ohjaavat kääntäjän suhtautumista lastenkirjoihin. Käännöksen tulisi sopia kohdekulttuurin polysysteemin valmiisiin malleihin, jolloin esimerkiksi satiiri voi muuttua fantasiasaduksi, jos satiiri ei ole tunnettu malli kohdekulttuurin lastenkirjallisuuden polysysteemissä. Toiseksi lasten arvioitu ymmärryksen taso ja vallitsevat moraaliset arvot voivat johtaa tekstin adaptoimiseen. Lisäksi karakterisaation kompleksisuus tai tyyllilliset ja ideologiset seikat voivat myös vaikuttaa manipulaatioon. (Shavit 1986: 113—128.)

Oittinen (2000: 5—6) kiinnittää huomiota siihen, miten käännösdiskurssissa adaptaation määritelmä koskee usein sitä, miten jokin teksti poikkeaa alkuperäisestä. Joidenkin tutkijoiden mielestä kääntämisen tarkoitus on pyrkiä samuuteen, ja adaptaatio on tällöin jotain muuta. Adaptaatioita verrataan alkuteoksiin ja ne nähdään alempiarvoisina. (Oittinen 2000: 74, 76.) Oittisen mukaan adaptaatio ja kääntäminen eivät kuitenkaan ole eri asioita, sillä jokaisessa käännösprosessissa tapahtuu adap-

taatiota; kääntäessä adaptoimme tekstejämme jatkuvasti tiettyjen tarkoitusten ja yleisöjen saavuttamiseksi (Oittinen 2000: 80, 82). Tärkeää on Oittisen (2000: 84) mukaan vain se, miten käännökset toimivat todellisissa tilanteissa. Hän itse korostaa lukijan, lapsen ja kääntäjän näkökulmia. Kääntäjän oma lukukokemus muovaa käännöstä, josta tulee näin ollen täysin uusi teksti, ei mikään lähtötekstin jäljennös. Oittinen ([1995]2006: 84—89.) käyttää Bahtinin termejä dialogisuudesta ja karnivalistisuudesta tutkimuksensa perustana. Herättääkseen käännöksensä eloon kääntäjän tulee osallistua dialogiin lähtötekstin, lapsilukijan sekä oman lapsikuvansa kanssa, ja tuottaa kohdeteksti, joka tavoittaa ensisijaisen yleisönsä. Lastenkulttuuria voi verrata karnevaaliin; epävirallisen luonteensa takia sillä ei ole auktoriteettia tai sääntöjä. Aikuisten tulisi ymmärtää tarttua sen potentiaaliin; yhteinen dialogi voi auttaa synnyttämään uusia tulkintoja, joissa myös kunnioitus alkuperäistä teosta kohtaan säilyy. (Oittinen [1995]2006: 84—89.) Kuvat, sanat ja tekstit ovat osa karnivalistista dialogia, jossa eri tilanteissa lukijat tulkitsevat näitä merkkejä eri tavoin ja irtautuvat lukemastaan. Samalla tavalla kääntäminen merkitsee erkaantumista alkutekstistä. Uuden tulkinnan perustana onkin aina kääntäjän oma tulkinta lähtötekstin lukijana. Tämän vuoksi kääntäminen on uudelleenkirjoittamista, muuttamista ja positiivista manipulaatiota. (Oittinen [1995]2006: 97.)

Kuvakirja — käännettävänä kaksi mediaa

Kuvitus on lastenkirjallisuuden yksi erityispiirteistä (Oittinen 2000: 4—5). Kuvakirja on yksi esimerkki kuvitetusta lastenkirjasta, mutta aivan kuten lastenkirjallisuuden kohdalla, senkin määritelmästä on eriaviä mielipiteitä. Perry Nodelmanin (1988: vii) mukaan kuvakirjat ovat pienille lapsille suunnattuja teoksia, joiden tarkoitus on välittää tietoa tai kertoa tarinoita kuvasarjojen avulla — joko ilman tekstiä tai vähäisen tekstimäärän avulla. Ääneen lukeminen on myös hyvin tärkeä piirre kuvakirjoissa. Yhteinen lukuhetki auttaa muun muassa kehittämään lapsen tunne-elämää. Läheisyyden ja kuulluksi tulemisen kokemus muovaavat lapsen identiteettiä, sillä hän pääsee kokemaan olevansa tärkeä. (Heinimaa 2001: 161.)

Kuvilla on tärkeä funktio, sillä ne ovat usein lapsen ensimmäinen kohtaaminen visuaalisen kielen eli taiteen kanssa (Heinimaa 2001: 155). Kuvien avulla vielä lukutaidotonkin lapsi pääsee aktiivisesti osallistumaan lukukokemukseen; kuvia katselemalla hän muodostaa käsityksen tarinasta ja sen maailmasta (Launis 2001:

69). Kuvat ja sanat avaavat lukijalle kaksi eri maailmaa, ja tämä kaksitahoinen luonne on seurausta verbaalisen ja visuaalisen yhteistyöstä. Kuvakirja onkin elliptinen teksti, jossa kuva tai sana yksinään ei voi kuljettaa tarinaa eteenpäin, vaan ne täydentävät toinen toisiaan. (Oittinen 2004: 52.)

Oittinen (2001a: 123) korostaa kuvakirjojen kääntämisessä sitä, että kyse ei ole vain tekstien kääntämisestä: kääntäjän täytyy tulkita tekstuaalisen maailman lisäksi myös kuvallisia elementtejä. Visuaalinen lukutaito on tärkeää, sillä kuvat ovat myös osa käännettävää kokonaisuutta (Oittinen 2000: 101). Kääntäjän tulee ymmärtää, mitä kuvat ovat ja mikä niiden tarkoitus teoksessa kulloinkin on (Oittinen 2004: 64). Tekstin ja kuvituksen lisäksi luettavuus ja ääneenlukutilanne on myös otettava huomioon. Tekstin on oltava sujuvaa, jotta lapsi tai aikuinen voi lukea sitä helposti ääneen, ja kuvien ja tekstin on tuettava toinen toisiaan. (Oittinen 2001a: 122.) Kuvitus voi osoittautua ongelmalliseksi silloin, kun kääntäjä haluaa adaptoida tai manipuloida tekstiä jollain tavalla. Kulttuurispesifisiin elementteihin voi olla hankala puuttua, jos ne esiintyvät myös kuvituksessa. Toisaalta, kuvat voivat antaa kääntäjälle vihjeitä, jotka auttavat sopivien käännösvastineiden valinnassa. (Oittinen 2004: 114, 124—125).

Kuvakirjan visuaalinen maailma ei koostu vain kuvista, vaan myös typografiasta, layoutista ja kirjan kannesta. Kaikki tekijät vaikuttavat yhdessä lukukokemukseen, ja myös kääntäjän on harkittava yksittäisiä osioita suhteessa koko teokseen; mitään elementtiä ei saisi jättää huomiotta. (Oittinen 2001c: 140.) Lisäksi kääntäjän tulisi tunnistaa hermeneuttiset aukot. Kuvakirjalle on tyypillistä se, että tekijä ei kerro lukijalle kaikkea eksplisiittisesti, vaan lukija täyttää informaatioaukot omalla tulkinallaan. Koska kääntäjät ovat tottuneet tekemään epäselvistä ilmauksista eksplisiittisempiä, he voivat vahingossa poistaa kirjasta hermeneuttisia aukkoja. (Oittinen 2001b: 168—169.)

Skopos-teoria

Skopos-teoriassa kohdetekstin (*translatum*) tarkoitus (*skopos*) määrää käännöksen sisällön. Reissin ja Vermeerin (2013: 17—18) mukaan lähtöteksti nähdään tekstin tuottajan informaatiotarjouksena lukijalle. Informaatiotarjouksen sisältöön vaikuttavat ne oletukset, joita tuottajalla on kohdeyleisöstään ja heidän tilanteistaan. Myös

kääntäjän kohdeteksti tarjoaa informaatiota uudelle vastaanottajakunnalle. Vastaanotettuaan lähtötekstin hän tuottaa kohdetekstin, jossa informoi kohdeyleisöään lähtötekstin informaatiotarjouksesta. Myös tätä prosessia ohjaavat kääntäjän odotukset kohdeyleisöään kohtaan. Näin ollen lähtö- ja kohdeteksti tarjoavat informaatiota eri tavoin, sillä niiden tuottajilla on erilaiset odotukset eri kulttuuri- ja kieliyhteisöihin kuuluvia vastaanottajiaan kohtaan. (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 113.) Kääntäjä valikoi lähtötekstistä skopoksen kannalta olennaiset elementit, ja hän siirtää ne kohdekulttuuriin skopoksen vaatimalla tavalla. (Nord 1997: 26.)

Käännöksen informaatiotarjous riippuu vastaanottajan tilanteesta, kohdekulttuurista ja -kielestä, sillä tarjotun informaation tarkoituksenmukaisuus arvioidaan näiden seikkojen perusteella. Kääntäjän tulee pitää mielessään, missä muodossa kohdeyleisö odottaa informaation tarjottavan. Kääntäjällä on merkittävä rooli prosessissa, sillä hän on viime kädessä se, joka päättää, mitkä tekstit käännetään, milloin ne käännetään ja miten. Nämä päätökset puolestaan perustuvat hänen tietämykseensä lähtö- ja kohde kulttuureista ja -kielistä. (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 74—78.) Ihanteellisessa tapauksessa asiakas pystyy antamaan mahdollisimman yksityiskohtaista tietoa käännöksen skopoksesta (Vermeer 1989: 183—184).

Kääntämistä ohjaa siis aina käännöksen tarkoitus. Käännösstrategia on alisteinen skopokselle, eli tarkoitus määrää, miten käännös toteutetaan. Kääntäjän ensisijaisena tavoitteena tulisi olla käännöksen tarkoituksen täyttäminen — ei se, että käännösprosessi toteutetaan jollain tietyllä tavalla. (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 85, 89.) Tämä periaate pyrkii tekemään lopun vapaata ja kirjaimellista kääntämistä koskevasta kiistasta. Vapaa kääntäminen voi olla tietyn skopoksen saavuttamiseksi tarpeen, mutta jokin toinen skopos saattaa vaatia kirjaimellisempaa lähestymistapaa. (Nord 1997: 29.)

Lisäksi on huomioitava, että skopos on vastaanottajasta riippuva muuttuja (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 90). Skoposta ei voida asettaa, jollei kohdeyleisöä pystytä mitenkään arvioimaan; tekstille asetetun funktion mielekkyys on arvioitava kohdelukijan näkökulmasta. (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 91—92.) Kohdetekstillä voikin olla eri skopos kuin lähtötekstillä, sillä lähtötekstin skopoksen säilyttäminen ei ole kääntämisen perusvaatimus (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 92).

Reiss ja Vermeer (2013: 107) muodostavat kääntämiselle hierarkkiset säännöt. Ensimmäisen (1) säännön mukaan kohdetekstin määrää sen *skopos*. Toinen (2) sääntö on se, että kohdeteksti on kohdekielelle ja -kulttuurille laadittu informaatio-tarjous lähtökielisestä ja -kulttuurisesta informaatiotarjouksesta. Kolmannen (3) säännön mukaan kohdeteksti on yksilöllinen, ei-palautettavissa oleva kartoitus lähtökulttuurin informaatiotarjouksesta. (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 107.) Tämä sääntö kertoo, että kääntäjä valitsee joitain osia lähtötekstin informaatio-tarjouksesta ja tuottaa niistä uuden informaatiotarjouksen kohdekulttuuriin. Uusi informaatiotarjous on uniikki, ja näin ollen takaisinkäännös tuskin tuottaa lähtötekstin informaatiotarjousta. (Nord 1997: 32.) Neljännen (4) säännön mukaan kohdetekstin tulee olla sisäisesti koherentti, eli kohdeyleisön on voitava ymmärtää heille annettu teksti. Viidennen (5) säännön mukaan kohdetekstin tulee myös olla lähtötekstin kanssa koherentti. (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 107.) Tämä tarkoittaa sitä, että käännöksen on oltava jollain tasolla yhteydessä lähtötekstiin (Nord 1997: 32). Viimeinen (6) sääntö toteaa, että kyseiset säännöt ovat hierarkkisesti järjestäytyneet (Reiss & Vermeer 2013: 107). Koherenttius lähtötekstin kanssa on siis vähiten tärkeä kriteeri käännökselle.

Analyysi

Tutkimusmateriaalin tarkastelu paljastaa, että lähtö- ja kohdetekstillä on sama *skopos*: viihdyttää lapsilukijaa ja opettaa hänelle aakkosia. Teoksen kompositio on myös osa *skoposta*, sillä käännöksen on täytettävä aakkosten ja kuvituksen sille asettamat rajoitukset.

Aakkosten lokalisointi

Lähtötekstissä aakkoset noudattavat vakiintunutta latinalaista järjestystä (A, B, C, D... Z), mutta kohdetekstissä ne ovat pääsääntöisesti sekalaisessa järjestyksessä. Alkuperäinen teos myös sisältää foneemit CH, SH ja TH, joita ei esiinny suomen kielessä. Suomennokseen on lisätty foneemi NG/ NK, sekä aakkosjärjestelmäämme kuuluvat ääkköset (Å, Ä ja Ö). Alkuteksti sisältää omilla aukeamillaan aakkosia, jotka ovat suomenkielessä harvinaisia. Kyseiset aakkoset esiintyvät meillä lähinnä vierasperäisissä lainasanoissa. Kääntäjän ratkaisuna on ollut siirtää nämä harvinaiset aakkoset (B, C, F, Q, X, Y, Z, Å) kirjan loppuun viimeiselle aukeamalle ja kirjoittaa kustakin vain muutama esimerkki. Alkutekstissä viimeisellä aukeamalla ovat vain X,

Y ja Z. Jostain syystä suomennoksesta puuttuu G-kirjain kokonaan, enkä keksi asialle muuta selitystä kuin sen, että kyseinen aakkonen on yksinkertaisesti unohdettu lisätä teokseen.

Yllä luetellut ongelmat ovat johtaneet siihen, että suomenkielisessä kohdetekstissä viisi aakkosta (I, E, K, P ja T) esiintyy teoksessa kahdesti, ja aakkosten järjestys on muutettu. Suomen ja englannin aakkosjärjestelmien erot korostuvat aiheuttaen käännösongelman. Saavuttaakseen käännöksen skopoksen, kääntäjän on adaptoitava, tai lokalisoitava, aakkoset kohdekulttuuriin sopiviksi. Tämä on johtanut siihen, että ääkköset on lisättävä tekstiin, aakkosten järjestystä on muutettava, joitain aakkosia joutuu käyttämään useammin kuin kerran ja joidenkin aakkosten käyttöä on vähennettävä. Näin käännöksen informaatiotarjous eroaa alkutekstin informaatiotarjouksesta, sillä siihen vaikuttavat kääntäjän oletukset yleisöstään ja heidän tilanteistaan, jotka eroavat lähtötekstin tuottajan odotuksista omaa yleisöään kohtaan.

Mikäli kääntäjä olisi pitäytynyt alkutekstin aakkosjärjestyksessä, hän olisi joutunut kiperien käännöspulmien eteen. Kääntäjän tulisi keksiä harvinaisille aakkosille kokonaisen aukeaman verran esimerkkejä, jotka liittyvät kuvituksiin. Monet esimerkeistä sisältäisivät väistämättä hankalia lainasanoja, jotka tekisivät tekstistä vaikeasti ymmärrettävän ja luettavan. Kuten aiemmin mainittiin, kuvakirjojen kieli on yleensä helppoa ja muistuttaa puhetta (Oittinen 2004: 27). Hankalien vierasperäisten sanojen lisääminen suomennokseen tekisi siitä vaikeammin ymmärrettävän kuin lähtötekstin, sillä sen kieli on melko helppolukuista. Lapsi tai lukeva aikuinen saattaa menettää kiinnostuksensa teosta kohtaan, jos sen kieli ei ole helposti ymmärrettävää. Myös Klingbergin (1986: 11—12) termin kohdetekstin adaptaation asteesta tulisi tällöin alhaisempi kuin alkutekstin.

Aakkosten ja kuvien asettamat rajoitukset

Aakkonen rajaa käytettävissä olevia käännösratkaisuja huomattavasti. Esimerkiksi lähtötekstissä esiintyy D-aukeamalla sana ”bulldozer”, ja kääntäjä voi valita kirjaimellisen vastineen vain, jos se sisältää suomennokseen valitun aakkosen. Suomeksi ”bulldozer” olisi ”puskutraktori”, mutta kohdetekstin aukeamalle on valittu aakkoseksi E. Näin ollen kääntäjä ei voi valita kirjaimellista vastinetta, sillä se ei täytä aakkosen sille asettamaa vaatimusta. Käännösratkaisuja rajaa myös se, että

suomennoksen on oltava yhteensopiva kuvituksen kanssa. Esimerkiksi puskutraktorin kohdalla kääntäjä on korvannut sanan ”bulldozer” termillä ”telaketjut”. Näin ollen kääntäjä on saanut sisällytettyä e-kirjaimen käännökseensä, eikä teksti ole ristiriidassa kuvan kanssa, sillä puskutraktorissa on telaketjut. Monissa muissakin kohdissa kääntäjä on päätenyt samankaltaiseen ratkaisuun: hän on korvannut lähtötekstin sanan jollain muulla, kuvaan liittyvällä termillä.

Myös dialogin hyödyntäminen käännösratkaisuissa on yksi strategia. Kuvan ja aakkosen aiheuttama ongelma on mahdollista kiertää panemalla hahmot puhumaan. Esimerkiksi lähtötekstin (O) ja kohdetekstin (O) sivulla 39 on kuva pöllöstä, joka heittää uppoavan laivan kapteenille köyden. Lähtötekstissä kuvataan tilannetta näin: ”owl tossing a rope” (suom. pöllö heittämässä köyttä). Suomennoksessa pöllön hahmolle on annettu ääni: ”Ota koppi.”

Toinen mahdollinen käännösratkaisu on spesifikaatio (tarkentaminen), joka sisältää valitun aakkosen. Myös kuvitus on tällöinkin otettava huomioon suomennosta laadittaessa. Esimerkiksi kohdetekstin sivulla 21 on kuvattu lipputangossa liehuva lippu. Suomennokseen on valittu aakkonen E tälle aukeamalle. Lähtötekstissä aakkonen on F, ja kuvitukseen viitataan sanalla ”flag” (”lippu”). Kohdeteksti sen sijaan kuvaa näkymää lauseella ”lippu liehuu”. Koska kirjaimellinen vastine (lippu) ei sisällä aakkosta E, kääntäjä on ratkaissut ongelman lisäämällä siihen predikaatin (liehuu). Toinen esimerkki spesifikaatiosta on kohdetekstin sivulla 30 (K) esiintyvä sana ”kulta-avain”. Kuvassa on kuningas, jonka taskussa on keltainen avain. Alkuteksti kuvaa esinettä vain sanalla ”key” (”avain”). Molemmista esimerkeistä voi havaita, että ne ovat yhteensopivia sekä aakkosen että kuvan kanssa. Ne tuovat hyvin esiin myös sen, miten kääntäjä on hakenut kuvista inspiraatiota käännökseensä.

Poisto ja lisäys ovat myös mahdollisia käännösratkaisuja. Mikäli kääntäjä ei keksi sopivaa vastinetta tietylle sanalle ja kuvalle, hän voi jättää sen pois kokonaan. Usein kääntäjä on kuitenkin lisännyt jonkin muun sanan tai lauseen johonkin toiseen kohtaan aukeamaa kompensoidakseen poistoa. Esimerkiksi kohdetekstin aukeamalla O (s. 39—40) esiintyvät sanat ”auto”, ”laatikko” ja ”katto”, jotka viittaavat tiellä ajavaan siniseen autoon, laivasta putoavaan laatikkoon ja hotellin keltaiseen kattoon. Lähtöteksti ei viittaa näihin yksityiskohtiin millään sanoilla, mutta sen sijaan se

sisältää toisten yksityiskohtien yhteydessä muutamia muita sanoja, joita kohdetekstissä ei mainita.

Monissa tapauksissa kirjaimellinen käännös on kuitenkin mahdollinen. Tällöin vastine täyttää sekä aakkosen että kuvan asettaman vaatimuksen. Esimerkiksi lähtötekstin (C) ja kohdetekstin (I) sivuilla 12—13 on monta kirjaimellista käännösratkaisua: ”cup”—”kuppi”, ”coffee pot”—”kahvipannu”, ”accordion”—”haitari”. Näyttääkin siltä, että mikäli suomenkielinen, kirjaimellinen vastine sisältää valitun aakkosen, sitä on lähes aina myös käytetty sellaisenaan.

Pidemmät tekstikappaleet osoittautuvat usein vielä hankalammiksi, sillä niissä valittu aakkonen esiintyy useammissa sanoissa. Esimerkiksi kohdetekstin sivuilla 18—19 kuvataan palomiesten saapumista pupujen talolle. Talosta nousee savua, ja kaksi pupua on talossa: toinen ikkunassa ja toinen parvekkeella. Käännöksessä aukeaman aakkonen on P, mutta alkutekstissä se on E. Ohessa on lähtöteksti sekä kohdeteksti:

Esimerkki 1

Ernie Elephant and his excellent firemen have just driven up to extinguish an enormous fire. Mother Rabbit is screaming for help. Do not fear! They will save her! (lähtöteksti)

Pappa Puputti paistoi perunoita ja poltti ne. **Pupuruuva** pelästyi ja kipitti **rappuja** pitkin **parvekkeelle**. Sitten hän hälytti **palokunnan**. (kohdeteksti, s. 18)

Samanlaisia esimerkkejä löytyy kohdetekstistä paljon. Vaikuttaakin enemmän säännöltä kuin poikkeukselta, että pidemmät tekstikappaleet on käännetty vapaammin. Käännökset eivät ole ”uskollisia” tai kirjaimellisia, mikäli asiaa ajatellaan samuuden kannalta. Ne myös edustavat sitä informaatiotarjousta, jonka kääntäjä on halunnut välittää kohdeyleisölleen. Esimerkit näyttävät lisäksi tukevan Oittisen (2000: 84) näkemystä, jonka mukaan kääntäjän tulkinnan kautta tekstistä tulee täysin uusi teksti, eikä mikään alkuperäisen teoksen kopio. Lopuksi esimerkistä huomaa, miten Reissin ja Vermeerin (2013: 107) sääntö (3) pitää paikkansa tässä tapauksessa; takaisin-käännös ei tuottaisi lähtötekstin informaatiotarjousta.

Kertojan ja lukijan välinen vuorovaikutus

Kuten edellä mainittiin, Scarry halusi edistää uudenlaista lukukokemusta, jossa lapsilukijalle tarjoutuu mahdollisuuksia pysähtyä kommentoimaan kuvituksen yksi-

tyiskohtia. *Richard Scarry's ABC Word Book*issa hän toteutti tätä piirrettä lisäämällä lukijalle kysymyksiä tekstiin. Esimerkiksi aukeamalla on kuva pellollaan traktorilla ajelevasta ketusta. Maalaistalon yläkerran ikkunasta kurkistelee viisi kettua. Lähtötekstissä kertoja kysyy lukijalta, pystyykö tämä löytämään ne.

Myös kääntäjä on säilyttänyt tämän piirteen kohdetekstissä, vaikkakaan ei aina samoissa yhteyksissä kuin kirjailija. Kysymyksiä on lisätty muualle tekstiin, tai lähtötekstin kysymystä on muokattu kohdetekstiä varten. Nämä interaktiiviset elementit on siis nähty tärkeänä säilyttää käännöksessä. Yksi skopos-teorian pääteeseistä oli se, että käännös informoi lukijaa lähtötekstin informaatiotarjouksesta. Tässä kohdassa interaktiiviset piirteet on nähty tärkeinä informaatiotarjouksina, ja siten myös skopoksen saavuttamisen kannalta.

Henkilöhahmojen nimet ja kotouttaminen

Kirjassa esiintyvien hahmojen nimet on kotoutettu suomennoksessa. Esimerkiksi lähtötekstin ”Huckle” on käännetty Hessuksi, ja ”Lowly Worm” Mato Matalaksi, Nimien kotouttaminen oli pitkään melko yleinen käytäntö Suomessa. Kun tietämys vieraista kulttuureista lisääntyy, myös asenne vieraita elementtejä kohtaan muuttuu hyväksyvämmäksi. Oittisen (Paloposki & Oittinen 2008: 384) mukaan tämä muutos tapahtui Suomessa 1980- ja 1990-luvuilla, jolloin anglosaksinen vaikutus kasvoi. Trendi heijastui muun muassa käännöksiin; ihmemaan Liisa ei ollutkaan enää vuoden 1995 suomennoksessa Liisa, vaan Alice (Paloposki & Oittinen 2008: 384). Nykyisin nimet jätetään yhä useammin kääntämättä, mutta ilmiö riippuu myös genrestä. Nimien kotouttamista tapahtuu edelleen fantasia- ja scifi-kirjallisuudessa, mutta myös pienille lapsille suunnatuissa teoksissa. Viimeksi mainitussa tapauksessa kirjan luettavuus vaikuttaa päätökseen adaptoida henkilöhahmojen nimiä. (Oittinen 2004: 97.) Scarry-käännösten kohdalla on myös muistettava, että monille kirjailijan tutuille hahmoille on olemassa vakiintuneet käännökset. Lukija saattaa hämmentyä, jos suomentaja käyttääkin joitain muita vastineita kohdetekstissään. Lisäksi olisi epäjohdonmukaista, mikäli kääntäjä käyttäisi tutujen hahmojen kohdalla vakiintuneita vastineita, mutta jättäisi muut nimet kääntämättä. Kuten Oittinen (2000: 81) toteaa, kääntäminen ei ole vain tekstien kääntämistä, vaan koko tekstitilanteiden kääntämistä. Se, miten nimet on aiemmissa Scarry-käännöksissä käännetty, vaikuttaa

tähän koko tilanteeseen. Intertekstuaalisuus on syytä ottaa tapauksessa huomioon, sillä hahmot viittaavat myös muihin Scarry-kirjoihin ja -käännöksiin.

Kohdetekstissä on myös havaittavissa kulttuurisen kontekstin adaptaatiota ja lokalisaatiota. Esimerkiksi sivuilla 14—15 on kuva lumisesta kylästä, jossa henkilöt tekevät erilaisia aktiviteetteja. Alkutekstissä aukeaman foneemi on CH, mutta kohdetekstissä on aakkonen J. Sivulla 15 on ryhmä lapsia, joita lähtöteksti kuvaa lauseella ”**children caroling**” (”lapset laulavat joululauluja”). Suomennoksessa kuvituksen yhteydessä on Sylvian joululaulun alkusanat: ”Ja niin jouljoutui jo taas pohjolaan...”

Klingbergin (1986) näkemyksen mukaan yllä esiteltyt esimerkit sisältävät tarpeetonta kulttuurisen kontekstin adaptaatiota, sillä adaptaation aste on nyt korkeampi kuin alkutekstissä. Lähtöteksti ei edes sisällä kulttuurispesifisiä elementtejä, mutta käännös tuo kohdetekstin lähemmäs lukijan kulttuurista ympäristöä lokalisaation avulla. Kuitenkin jos lähtökohtana käännökselle on sen aiottu tarkoitus, skopos, tämän käännösstrategian sopivuus tulee arvioida vain suhteessa valittuun skopokseen. Koska tekstin skopos on viihdyttää pieniä lapsia ja opettaa heille aakkosia, en pidä kotouttamista tai lokalisaatiota ristiriitaisina strategioina päämäärän saavuttamisessa.

Päätelmät

Yllä eriteltyä käännöstä tarkastellaan nyt lähemmin Reissin ja Vermeerin (2013: 107) skopos-teorian sääntöjen valossa (ks. luku 4). Ensimmäinen (1) sääntö toteutuu sillä, että kohdetekstin *skopos* on auttaa pieniä lapsia oppimaan aakkosia sisällyttämällä tietyn aakkosen tekstiin, joka liittyy kiinteästi aukeaman kuviin. Tämä on käännösprosessin punainen lanka, joka vaikuttaa kääntäjän tekemiin käännösratkaisuihin — kuten edellä eriteltyistä esimerkeistä voidaan havaita. Lisäksi suomennoksen kieli on pidetty yksinkertaisena ja siten helposti ymmärrettävänä, mikä osaltaan auttaa skopoksen saavuttamisessa. Sääntö kaksi (2) toteutuu aakkosten lokalisoinnin avulla, sekä niissä kohdissa, joissa kääntäjä adaptoi tekstiään vastaamaan aakkosen ja kuvien sille asettamia rajoituksia. Myös kertojan ja lukijan välinen vuorovaikutussuhde edustaa kääntäjän valitsemaa informaatiotarjousta. Kolmas (3) sääntö käy ilmi useista edellä annetuista esimerkeistä: takaisinkäännös ei tuottaisi tismalleen samaa informaatiotarjousta kuin lähtöteksti. Kääntäjä tekstin ja kuvien vastaanottajana tulkitsee ne omalla tavallaan ja valitsee materiaalista ne elementit, jotka auttavat

skopoksen saavuttamisessa. Sääntö neljä (4) täyttyy myös tämän käännöksen kohdalla; teksti on sisäisesti koherentti ja ymmärrettävä suomalaiselle lukijalle. Yksinkertainen kieli vaikeiden lainasanojen sijaan myös edesauttaa ymmärrettävyyden saavuttamista. Lopuksi viides (5) sääntö pitää myös paikkansa, sillä lähtö- ja kohdetekstien välillä on selvä yhteys kuvituksen kautta. Intertekstuaalinen koherenssi toteutuu myös niiltä osin, kun kääntäjä on laatinut kirjaimellisen vastineen. Kuudes (6) sääntö toteutuu, sillä intertekstuaalinen koherenssi on selvästi alisteinen skopokselle ja intratekstuaaliselle koherenssille.

Käännös näyttää noudattavan monia lastenkirjallisuuden kääntämisestä esitettyjä huomioita. Tekstin luettavuus on huomioitu, sillä se on kieleltään helppolukuista ja ymmärrettävää. Lisäksi Oittisen (2004: 114, 124—125) ajatukset kuvan rajaavista ja inspiroivista ominaisuuksista näkyvät käännösratkaisuissa. Myös nimien kotouttaminen näyttää tukevan Oittisen (2004: 27) näkemystä siitä, että pienille lapsille nimet usein kotoutetaan. Myös suomennoksen ensi-ilmistymisen aikaan kotouttaminen oli normaali käytäntö.

Yksittäisissä tekstikohdissa esiintyneet lokalisoivat elementit olivat mielenkiintoinen huomio. Klingbergin (1986) mukaan nämä edustavat tarpeetonta kulttuurisen kontekstin adaptaatiota, sillä lähtötekstiä tulisi manipuloida niin vähän kuin mahdollista. Oittinen (2000) sen sijaan ei vastusta adaptaatiota, sillä se kuuluu luonnollisena osana jokaiseen käännösprosessiin. Hänen mielestään käännösprosessissa tärkeintä on koko kääntämisen tilanne — niin kääntäjän, hänen lapsikäsitteensä kuin lukijankin kannalta. Koska käännöksen skopos on auttaa lapsilukijaa oppimaan aakkosia, adaptaatio ei mielestäni ole mitenkään ristiriidassa tämän tavoitteen kanssa.